

# BACONIANA



Lewis Siddulph,  
Cairo, Egypt.

Vol. XII. THIRD SERIES.

# BACONIANA

A Quarterly Magazine.

LONDON:  
GAY & HANCOCK, LIMITED,  
12 & 13 HENRIETTA ST., STRAND, W.C.  
1914.

*"Therefore we shall make our judgment upon the things themselves as they give light one to another and, as we can, dig Truth out of the mine."*

—FRANCIS BACON.

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
The First Folio .. .. .	9, 73
Did Bacon Die in 1626 ? .. .. .	25, 110
Bacon and Portugal .. .. .	.. 38
Jottings on Lord Bacon .. .. .	45, 171, 231
The Bordeaux Copy of Montaigno's Essays .. .. .	.. 51
Dr. H. H. Furness on Desdemona .. .. .	.. 56
Newman and Baconianism .. .. .	.. 59
Mr. George Greenwood, M.P. .. .. .	.. 65
Something about Arundel House, Highgate .. .. .	.. 96
Cheveril the Lawyer .. .. .	.. 103
" I am that I am " .. .. .	.. 107
Resusitatio, 1657 .. .. .	.. 113
" The Athenæum " owes an Apology .. .. .	.. 115
The Stratford Player .. .. .	.. 118
William Shakespere of Stratford .. .. .	.. 133
The Boar Initial .. .. .	.. 149
" The Felicities of Queen Elizabeth " .. .. .	.. 152
" The Master-Mistress " identified .. .. .	.. 159
James Spedding .. .. .	.. 164
Did Bacon write " Don Quixote " ? .. .. .	.. 169
Bacon and Virginia .. .. .	.. 177
The Date of New Year's Day .. .. .	.. 197
Stratford and St. Albans, A Contrast .. .. .	.. 203
Shakespere and Asbies .. .. .	143, 206
" The Golden Mettle of their Soldiers " .. .. .	.. 212
" The Dark Lady." (Sonnets 126-142) .. .. .	.. 218
The Rival Poet .. .. .	.. 227
Chief Events in the Life of Sir Thomas Meautys .. .. .	.. 237
The Speare and its Lore .. .. .	.. 242
Ophelia and Liege .. .. .	.. 244
Findings in the Folio .. .. .	.. 246
Correspondence .. .. .	70, 120, 194, 150
Reviews .. .. .	.. 70, 191
Notes .. .. .	.. 128
Obituary .. .. .	.. 179

## INDEX OF NAMES.

	PAGE			PAGE
Abbott, A. E.	54,	136	Coleridge, S. T.	81
André, Bernard	..	48	Collier, J. P.	.. 82
Arundel, Earl of	.. 28, 96,	128	Cooke, Sir A.	.. 174
Bacon, Lady A.	.. 156,	250	Cornwallis, Lady J.	.. 240
Bacon, Lady Alice	.. ..	26	Cornwallis, Sir T.	.. 96, 99
Bacon, Anthony	.. ..	39	Cornwallis, Sir W.	.. 45, 112
Bacon, Lady Jane	.. ..	45, 172	Craik, G. L.	.. 13, 83
Bacon, Sir Nath	.. ..	174	Cunningham, G. C.	.. 202
Bacon, Sir Nic.	39, 75,	156	Davenant, W.	.. 116
Baker, H. Kendra	.. ..	130	Dawbarn, C. Y. C.	.. 70
Barckley, Sir R.	.. ..	125	Delaware, Lord	.. 127
Barclay, John	.. ..	92	Dowden, Prof.	.. 137, 188
Beaumont, F.	.. ..	150	Dugdale, Sir W.	.. 116
Begley, Rev. W.	.. ..	103	Durning-Lawrence, Sir E.	79,
Berkeley, Lord	.. ..	36	130, 149, 169, 179, 189	
Bidder, Mr. Q. C.	.. ..	115	Durning-Lawrence, Lady	.. 180
Bishop, G.	.. ..	82	Eagle, R.	106, 110, 130,
Bishop, John	.. ..	125	164, 226, 230	
Bodley, Sir T.	.. ..	166	Edwards, W. H.	.. 68
Bompas, G. C.	.. ..	65	Eld, George,	.. 82
Boswell, Sir W.	.. ..	33	Field, Richard	.. 82, 92
Boyle, Lady	.. ..	132	Fiske, Mrs. A.	.. 194
Brach, Pierre de	.. ..	53	Fontenai, Abbe de	.. 52
Brook, Stopford	.. ..	57	Fuller, Mrs. L. D.	.. 195
Bryskett, L.	.. ..	193	Furness, H. H.	.. 20, 56
Bunten, Mrs.	25, 51, 122, 236,		Gam, Captain	.. 213
	241, 250		Garnett, Father	.. 99
Burghley, Lord	.. ..	103	Gascoigne, G.	.. 193
Burgoyne, F. J.	.. ..	184	Gates, Sir T.	.. 127
Burnham, Edward	.. 39,	245	Gervinus, Dr.	.. 81
Bushell, T.	.. ..	251	Glossop, Canon	.. 130
Camden, W.	.. ..	116	Golding, Arthur	.. 151
Cæsar, Sir J.	.. ..	28	Gondemar	.. 97
Capell, E.	.. ..	11	Gournay, Mlle. de	.. 52
Carleton, D.	.. ..	154	Greenwood, G.	.. 65
Chamberlain, J.	.. ..	154	Grey, Lord	.. 43, 45
Charles I.	.. ..	26	Grimstone, E.	.. 150
Clark and Glover	.. 11,	91	Grimstone, Sir H.	.. 47
Clarke, F. L.	.. ..	126		
Clifton, W. E.	.. 35,	249		

INDEX OF NAMES.

V.

	PAGE		PAGE
Hadrill, H. J. ..	125	Newman, Cardinal ..	59
Hall, Mrs. E. ..	141	Osborne, Francis ..	42
Hammer, Sir T. ..	10	Owen (Architect) ..	99
Hardy, Harold ..	148, 206, 211	Parma, Prince of ..	41
Harman, E. G. ..	131, 162, 191	Parry, Dr. ..	28
Harrington, J. ..	92	Parry, Sir T. ..	99
Harvey, Gabriel ..	150	Paulet, Sir A. ..	30
Haviland, J. ..	82	Platt, Hull ..	56
Heminge, J. ..	84	Pollard, A. H. ..	24
Herbert, George ..	33	Pope, A. ..	9
Herbert, Sir T. ..	199	Portugal, King of ..	38
Hickman, W. ..	233	Pott, Mrs. ..	25, 33, 36, 165
Holzer, H. G. ..	191	Powell, Thos. ..	34
Hookham, Geo. ..	76	Prickott, F. ..	98
Hopton, A. ..	198	Primaudaye, P. de la ..	125
Howitt, W. ..	99	Pryor, Mrs. R. A. ..	127
Hutchinson, J. ..	72, 120, 169	Raemond, F. de ..	53
Ingleby, Dr. ..	81	Rawley, W. ..	31, 112
Islip, Adam ..	82, 149	Reed, Edwin ..	13, 165, 242
Jaggard, W. ..	82	Rich, Sir R. ..	47
James I. ..	26, 97	Robertson, J. M. ..	65, 130, 188, 195
Johnson, Edwin ..	72	Rolfe, Dr. ..	14
Johnson, Dr. ..	10, 81, 139	Rosher, G. B. ..	25, 80, 91
Jones, Inigo ..	128	Ross, P. H. W. ..	128
Jonson, Ben ..	84, 96, 103, 133	R. J. of Grays I. ..	152
Julius, Duke ..	102	Schlegel ..	81
Kennedy de la Poer ..	33	Scott, Sir W. ..	133
Kenny, J. ..	13	Shakespeare, J. ..	143, 208
King, Dr. ..	45, 231	Shelley, H. C. ..	115
Lake, Sir T. ..	44	Sheppard, S. ..	116
Lambert, E. ..	144	Shawcross, Miss ..	185
Lambert, J. ..	208	Simpson, Percy ..	84
Lancham, R. ..	193	Somers, Sir G. ..	127
Leith, A. A. ..	44, 103, 121, 130, 179, 217, 244, 252	Smithson, E. W. ..	103, 142
Lessing ..	81	Spedding, James ..	164
Lloide, L. ..	125	Speed, John ..	49
Locker, John ..	152	Smedley, W. T. ..	56, 95, 107, 130
Major, R. H. ..	127	Stanton, H. ..	12
Mathew, Sir T. ..	34, 154, 237	Stewart, H. Hinton ..	59
Meautys, Thos. ..	32, 111, 121, 171, 196, 231, 239, 250	Stopes, Mrs. ..	143, 207
Meautys, Sir T. ..	121, 171, 196	Strachey, W. ..	127
Mendoza Don B. de ..	43	Strowski, Prof. ..	54
Montaigne, M. de ..	43, 51	Stuart, Lady A. ..	99
Montgomery, Earl ..	141	Sturm, John ..	44
Morgan, Dr. A. ..	130	Sullivan, Sir E. ..	81, 133
Muller, Max ..	65	Sutton, W. A. ..	64
		Tanner, E. V. ..	94
		Tenison, Archb. ..	152

## INDEX OF NAMES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Theobald, R. M.	165, 185, 189	Verulam, Earl .. ..	33
Theobald, Lewis	10, 60, 89	Warburton .. ..	10
Tomes, Henric	.. .. 93	White, R. Grant .. ..	11
Trott, Eva von	.. .. 101	Wilkins, John .. ..	36
Trott, Sir N. ..	.. .. 102	Witherbourne, Dr. .. ..	28
Trotter ..	.. .. 32	Wolstenholm .. ..	30
Turek, Dr. ..	.. .. 224	Woodward, Parker 38, 71, 113, 115, 122, 158, 168, 172, 196, 205, 249, 251	
Udney, Ernest	.. .. 124	Woollen, H. .. ..	127
Venables, G. S.	.. .. 165		



## INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Advancement of Learning	93, 107	Greek Tragedians	61
Arundel House	96, 112, 121, 173	Hamlet	224
Atheneum, The	115, 210	Henry IV., first Part	72
Attorney's Academy	34	Henry V.	215
Bacon's Handwriting	55	Henry VII., History of	48, 125
Bacon, Life of	31	Ignoto	126
Bacon's Monument	176	Isle of Devils	127
Bacon, Mystery of Francis	107	"Is it Shakespearo?"	103
Bacon and Portugal	38	Kenilworth Revels	194
Bacon Signatures	70, 77	Lancham's Letter	193
Bacon's Will	156	Leicester's Commonwealth	193
Baconian Heresy, The	65, 195	Lincoln's Inn Fields	128
Bacon Society, Sydney	130	Literary Legends	71
Barclay's Argenis	92	Manes Verulamiani	33
Bermudas	127	Master-Mistress, The	159
Bishop's Beautiful Blossoms	125	Mathematical Magic	36
Boar-Initial	149	Mercurius Britannicus	126
Charles I., History of	122	Mispagination	93
Cheveril the Lawyer	103	Montaigne's Essays	51
Concordance of Years	198	Netherlands History	150
Dark Lady, The	218	New Year's Day	197
Desdemona	56	Ophelia and Liege	44
Dial of Princes	125	Orlando Furioso	92
Discourse of Civill Life	193	Osborn's Advice	120, 136
Discovery of a New World	36	Owen's Hiding Places	101
Don Quixote	169, 221	Poetaster, The	103
Earth a Planet	36	Publius Syrus	129
Evenings with a Reviewer	165	Raleigh's History	212
Felicite of Man, The	125	Repertoire of Records	35
Felicities of Queen Elizabeth	152	Resusitatio	113
First Folio, The, 9, 73, 80, 141,	183, 246	Rise of English Culture	72
French Academy, The	125	Rival Poet	227
Gerard's Herbal	151		
Grammar of Assent	59		
Great Assizes of Parnassus	126		

	PAGE		PAGE
St. Alban's School ..	232	Stratford Player ..	118
St. Michael's Church ..	32, 45	Sylva Sylvarum ..	33, 112
Shakespeare and Ashbics	113, 206		
Shakespearian Punctuation ..	84	Theatre of Honour ..	82
Shakespeare and Stratford ..	115	Theatre of Worldlings ..	191
Shakespeare's Vocabulary ..	66	True Repertory (Stachey) ..	127
Shakspeare of Stratford ..	133		
Shepherd's Calender ..	191, 199	Uncrowned ..	70
Speare and Its Lore ..	242		
Spenser's Tomb ..	37	Venus and Adonis ..	159
Stratford and St. Albans ..	203	Virginia History ..	127, 177
Spenser and the Impersona- tions of Francis Bacon	131, 162, 192	Waverley Novels ..	134
Stratford Monument ..	117	Weekly Account, The ..	126



21

Handwritten text, possibly a page number or reference, located at the bottom left of the page.

JANUARY, 1914

## BACONIANA

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
The First Folio . . . . .	9
Did Bacon Die in 1626? . . . . .	25
Bacon and Portugal . . . . .	38
Jottings on Lord Bacon . . . . .	45
The Bordeaux Copy of Montaigne's Essays . . . . .	51
Dr. H. H. Furness on Desdemona . . . . .	56
Newman and Baconianism . . . . .	59
Mr. George Greenwood, M.P. . . . .	65
Review . . . . .	70
Correspondence . . . . .	70

LONDON

GAY &amp; HANCOCK, LIMITED,

18 &amp; 19, HENRIETTA ST STRAND WC

Cases for it  
can be had  
of the Publishers

# The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

---

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be :—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet ; also his character, genius, and life ; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakspeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea ; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

---

*The columns of BACONIANA are open for the expression of all shades of opinion on the subjects discussed therein, although such opinions may not be in accord with those held by the Council of the Society or the Editor of the Journal.*

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1914. No. 45.

---

## THE FIRST FOLIO.

**D**ID Bacon correct the proofs of the first Folio? First let us consider what the editors and commentators have said as to the proof correction.

Pope, after referring to the Quartos in these words, "What makes one think that most of them were not published by him (Shakespeare) is the excessive carelessness of the Press. Every page is so scandalously false spelled, and almost all the learned or unusual words so intolerably mangled, that it is plain there either was no corrector to the press at all, or one totally illiterate," goes on to say that the Folio is worse—"This edition is said to be printed from the original copies. I believe they meant those which had lain ever since the author's days in the playhouse, and had from time to time been cut, or added to, arbitrarily. It appears that this edition, as well as the Quartos, was printed (at least partly) from no better copies than the prompter's book or piecemeal parts written out for the use of the actors. For in some places their very names are through carelessness set down instead of the *personæ dramatis*. And in others the notes of direction to the property-men for their moveables, and to the players for their entries, are inserted into the text through the ignorance of the transcribers."

He further says, "Had Shakespeare published his works himself, we should find the errors lessened by some thousands."

Lewis Theobald says, "I shall proceed to consider him (Shakespeare) as a genius in possession of an everlasting name. And how great that merit must be which could gain it against all the disadvantages of the horrid condition in which he has hitherto appeared! Had Homer, or any other admired author, first started into publick so maimed and deform'd we cannot determine whether they had not sunk for ever under the ignominy of such an ill appearance."

Sir Thomas Hanmer: "From what causes it proceeded that the words of this author in the first publication of them were more injured and abused than perhaps any that ever passed the Press hath been sufficiently explained in the preface to Mr. Pope's edition . . . the corruptions are more numerous and of a grosser kind than can well be conceived but by those who have looked nearly into them."

Bishop Warburton: "His works left to the care of doorkeepers and prompters hardly escaped the common fate of those writings, how good soever, which are abandoned to their own fortune, and unprotected by party or cabal. At length, indeed, they struggled into light, but so disguised and travestied that no classic author after having run ten secular stages through the blind cloisters of monks and canons ever came out in half so maimed and mangled a condition."

Dr. Johnson: "His works were transcribed for the players by those who may be supposed to have seldom understood them: they were transmitted by copiers equally unskilful who still multiplied errors, they were perhaps sometimes mutilated by the actors for the sake of shortening the speeches; and were at last printed without correction of the Press."



Capell: "The faults and errors of the Quartos are all preserved in the Folio and others added to them, and what difference there is is generally for the worse on the side of the Folio editors, which should give us but faint hopes of meeting with greater accuracy in the plays which they first published, and accordingly we find them subject to all the imperfections that have been noted in the former."

Clark and Glover, in the preface to Vol. I. of the Cambridge Shakespeare, say that the natural inference to be drawn from the statements in the first Folio preface "is that all the separate editions of Shakespeare's plays were 'stolen,' 'surreptitious' and 'imperfect,' and that all those published in the Folio were printed from the author's own manuscripts. But it can be proved to demonstration that several of the plays in the Folio were printed from earlier Quarto editions," . . . and (referring to Heminge and Condell) "their duties as editors were probably limited to correcting and arranging the manuscripts and sending them to the Press. The 'over-seeing' of which they speak probably meant a revision of the MSS., not a correction of the Press, for it does not appear that there were any proof-sheets in those days sent either to author or editor. Indeed, we consider it as certain that after a MS. had been sent to Press it was seen only by the printers, and one or more correctors of the Press regularly employed by the publishers for that purpose."

Richard Grant White, referring to the Folio in his historical sketch of the text of Shakespeare, says: "Beside minor errors, the correction of which is obvious, words are in some cases so transformed as to be past recognition, even with the aid of the context; lines are transposed; sentences are sometimes broken by a full point followed by a capital letter, and at other times have their members displaced and mingled in incom-

prehensible confusion ; verse imprinted as prose and prose as verse ; speeches belonging to one character are given to another ; and, in brief, all possible varieties of typographical derangement may be found in this volume."

Howard Staunton refers to the Folio as follows : "Unhappily it is a very ill-printed book ; so badly edited and so negligently 'read' that it abounds not only with the most transparent typographical inaccuracies, but with readings disputable and nonsensical beyond belief . . . the clusters of misprints, the ruthless disregard of metrical propriety, the absolute absurdities of punctuation, which deform this volume, too plainly indicate that it received little or no literary supervision beyond that of the master printer who prepared it for the Press." And in a note he quotes as follows from the Rev. Joseph Hunter's preface to "New Illustrations of Shakespeare" : "Perhaps in the whole annals of English typography there is no record of any book of any extent and any reputation having been dismissed from the Press with less care and attention than the first Folio."

Professor G. L. Craik, in his "English of Shakespeare," says, "There is probably not a page in it (the Folio) which is not disfigured by many minute inaccuracies and irregularities, such as never appear in modern printing. The punctuation is throughout rude and negligent, even where it is not palpably blundering. The most elementary proprieties of the metrical arrangement are violated in innumerable passages. In some places the verse is printed as plain prose ; elsewhere prose is ignorantly and ludicrously exhibited in the guise of verse. Indisputable and undisputed errors are of frequent occurrence, so gross that it is impossible they could have been passed over, at any rate in such numbers, if the proof sheets had undergone any systematic revision by a qualified person, however rapid.

. . . Everything betokens that editor or editing of this volume, in any proper or distinctive sense, there was none. The only editor was manifestly the head workman in the printing office."

Professor Craik refers in a note to his article in the *North British Review* of February, 1854, in which he discussed at greater length the evidence of absence of editing. After making a detailed examination of the text of the first act of *Macbeth* as being a fair sample of the volume he says, "And what is the result at which we have arrived? In a portion of the text of the first Folio extending to only between four or five hundred lines we have found the number of readings which are either clearly, and for the most part confessedly erroneous, or such as at least do not seem to admit of satisfactory explanation or defence, to be not much under a hundred, or one for every five lines. The measure that we thus obtain of the correctness of the old Folio would give us about twenty false readings in every page, or *about twenty thousand in the entire volume.*"\*

In the Introduction to Thomas Kenney's "Life of Shakespeare" I find: "It is manifest, at all events, that several portions of this Folio edition must have been copied from the preceding quarto volumes; and it is equally certain that this is one of the most carelessly and incorrectly printed books, of any considerable importance and pretension, that ever issued from the Press."

Edwin Reed, in "Bacon *versus* Shakespeare," says, "Of the body of the work there was evidently no intelligent supervision." And in a note he says: "Bacon was banished from the Court and from London in 1621 and may not have had the opportunity if he had wished to supervise the publication. We know, however, that he was indifferent to the details of such an undertaking.

\* My italics.

He permitted the third edition of his *Essays*, printed in 1625, to go out so disfigured with excess of punctuation that it is to-day a typographical curiosity. It is literally cut into pieces with commas."

Editors, commentators and critics are, of course, not infallible, but it must be admitted that the foregoing opinions are the opinions of men whose names collectively stand for a great deal in the way of Shakespearean study, knowledge and authority; and in face of their practical unanimity it seems difficult to accept the view that the proofs of the Folio were read and corrected by the author. At all events the above-quoted opinions establish a *primâ facie* case to the contrary, which is entitled to hold the field until reasons are given for rejecting it.

We may look for ourselves at the typographical errors in the Folio and we shall see that they support the conclusions of the editors and others quoted above. I do not see any reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of Craik's estimate of the number as 20,000, but I cannot do more than attempt to illustrate the nature of the bulk by samples, giving a few instances of some of the various types.

*I.—Names of actors instead of characters.*

Doctor Rolfe, from whom I shall frequently quote in this part of my article, devoted much attention to the errors of printing in the Folio and I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to him. He says, in the "Life of Shakespeare" that he wrote as a supplement to the New Century edition:—

"But the case of the Folio is in some respects even worse than Craik makes it out. He says, for example, that 'in one instance at least we have actually the names of the actors by whom the play was performed prefixed to their portions of the dialogue, instead of those of the

*dramatis personæ*'; and that this 'shows very clearly the text of the play in which it occurs (*Much Ado About Nothing*) to have been taken from the playhouse copy, or what is called the prompter's book.' In this play a stage direction in ii. 3 reads thus in the Folio: "*Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, and lacke Wilson.*" Jack Wilson was evidently the singer who took the part of Balthasar. Again, in iv. 2, we find *Kemp* nine times and *Kem* three times prefixed to Dogberry's speeches, and *Cowley* twice and *Couley* once to the speeches of Verges. William Kemp and Richard Cowley are known to have been actors of the time in London. There are other instances of the kind apparently not known to Craik. In *3 Henry VI.*, i. 2, we find '*Enter Gabriel*' instead of '*Enter Messenger*,' and '*Gabriel*' is the prefix to the speech that follows. Again, in iii. 1 of the same play, we read, '*Enter Sinklo and Humfrey, with Crossebowes in their hands,*' where the modern editions have '*Enter two Keepers*,' etc.; and in the dialogue following we have *Sink* five times, *Sinklo* twice, and *Sin* once for the 1st Keeper, and *Hum* eight times for the 2nd Keeper. The same *Sinklo* appears also in *The Taming of the Shrew*, scene i. of induction, *Sinklo* being the prefix to the speech of one of the players ('I think 'twas Soto,' etc.). The 1600 Quarto of *2 Henry IV.* has also, in v. 4, '*Enter Sinklo and three or foure officers.*' He was evidently an actor of subordinate parts, and nothing else is known of him except that he played in *The Seven Deadly Sins* and in *The Malcontent* in 1604. In the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, v. 1., the Folio has '*Tawyer with a trumpet before them,*' where the actors in the clown's interlude first enter. Collier, Grant White, Dyce and others, suspected *Tawyer* to be the name of the actor who filled the part of 'presenter' and introduced the characters of the play; and it has been proved that they were right."

See also pp. 126 and 127 of Pollard's "Bibliographical Introduction to the Facsimiles of the Four Folios" published by Messrs. Methuen.

As a further example of careless printing of the names of the characters, I take the following from Craik's article in the *North British Review* already referred to.

"Then there is the blundering in various plays in regard to the names of the *dramatis personæ*. For instance, in the *Merchant of Venice* 'nothing,' says Mr. Knight, 'can be more confused than the manner in which the names of *Salarino* and *Solanio* are indicated. . . . In the text of the Folio we find *Salarino* and *Slarino*; *Salanio*, *Solanio* and *Salino*. . . . But if there be a confusion in these names even when given at length in the text, the abbreviations prefixed to the speeches are confusion worse confounded. *Salanio* begins with being *Sal.*, but he immediately turns into *Sola.*, and afterwards to *Sol.*; *Salarino* is at first *Salar*, then *Sala.*, and finally *Sal.*"

II.—*Misprints obvious from the sense of the context.*

Among these may be instanced—

(a) *Julius Cæsar*; Folio, p. 117; II. ii. 46,\* where Cæsar says:—

"Danger knows full well  
That Cæsar is more dangerous than he  
We heare two lions litter'd in one day,"

instead of "We are," or "We were," two lions, etc.

(b) *Romeo and Juliet*; Folio, p. 60; II. ii. 167, where when Romeo, on hearing Juliet utter his name, says—

"It is my soul that calls upon my name,' etc.,

and Juliet repeats "*Romeo*," the Folio makes Romeo murmur—

"My Neece," instead of "My Name."

See Webb's "Mystery of Shakespeare" p. 271.

\* The references to acts, scenes and lines are according to the numeration of "The Temple Shakespeare."

(c) *Love's Labour's Lost*; Folio, p. 136; V. i. 56, where the Folio makes Moth say

"The last of the five vowels if you repeat them, or the fifth if I,"

instead of

"The third of the five vowels if you repeat them or the fifth if I."

It is not material for the present purpose to decide what is the correct reading that should have been found instead of a misprint. For instance, it is not material whether "My Neece" ought to have been "My Name" or "My Sweet," or any and which other of the various readings that have been suggested. The point is whether we can believe that if the author had read the proofs he would have been content to let "My Neece" stand without correction. It may even be that in an occasional instance it may be thought that one of my examples of misprints is not a misprint at all. That may well happen, for as one of the commentators has said, it is hardly probable that there is any emendation of Shakespeare that in the present day would command unanimous assent. But the subtraction of an error here and there from the 20,000 is of no importance if it is admitted, as it must be, that there will be an immense number left after readily surrendering every doubtful one.

### III.—Foreign words misprinted.

(a) *Merry Wives*; Folio, p. 42; I. iv. 47; Rolfe p. 503.

"vnboyteene verd" for "un boitier vert."

(b) *Love's Labour's Lost*; Folio, p. 132; IV. ii. 99; Rolfe p. 504.

"vemchie, vencha, que non te vede, que non te perreche,"

for

"Venetia, Venetia chi non ti vede, non ti pretia,"

(c) *Love's Labour's Lost*; Folio, p. 141; V. ii. 533; Rolfe p. 504.

"Fortuna delaguar,"

probably for *Fortuna de la guerra or della guerra*.

IV.—Words so transformed as to be past recognition.

(a) *Timon of Athens*; Folio, p. 87; III. v. 112.

*Vlorxa.*

See p. 5 of Preface to *Timon* in Temple edition.

(b) *Merry Wives*; Folio, p. 45; II. i. 228.

"An-heires."

See "Reed's Coincidences," p. 70, for an interesting suggestion.

(c) *King Henry V.*; Folio, p. 87; IV. iv. 5.

"Qualitie calmie custure me."

See Webb's "Mystery of Shakespeare," pp. 266, 271.

V.—Errors of Punctuation.

(a) *Merchant of Venice*; Folio, p. 179; IV. i. 119.

*Duke.* —Come you from Padua, from Bellario ?

*Nerissa.*—From both, my lord. Bellario greets your Grace.

The above is printed in the Folio with a full stop after "both," and no stop after "lord," thus:—

*Nerissa.*—"From both.

My lord Bellario greets your Grace."

(b) *Troilus and Cressida*; IV. i. 20.

"And thou shalt hunt a lion that will fly

With his face backward. In humane gentleness

Welcome to Troy! now by Anchises' life

Welcome indeed."

The Folio has a comma after "backward" and a colon after "gentleness," thereby connecting "In

° Example (a) is in Roman type in the Folio, and examples (b) and (c) in italic type.



humane gentleness" with the lion instead of with Welcome.

(c) *Merry Wives*; Folio, p. 53; IV. i. 32.

The misused parentheses in

*Evans.*—"What is (*Lapis*) *William* ?

*Will.* — A Stone.

*Evans.*— And what is a Stone (*William* ?)

VI.—Some plays divided into Acts and Scenes and some not—some with *dramatis personæ*, and some not.

Rolfe says (p. 499):—

"There is another class of irregularities in the Folio which I do not remember to have seen classified, though the separate facts are referred to by many editors. *The Tempest*, the first play in the volume, is divided throughout into acts and scenes. We have *actus primus, scena prima, scena secunda, actus secundus, scena prima*, and so on to the end. The next three plays, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Measure for Measure*, are similarly divided. Then come five plays divided only into acts, though the first heading in two of them is *actus primus, scena prima*—*The Comedy of Errors*, *Much Ado*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Merchant of Venice*. As *You Like It*, which follows, has acts and scenes. In *The Taming of the Shrew*, the induction is not marked, the play beginning with *actus primus, scena prima*." The next heading is *actus tertia* (*sic*) in the proper place; and further on we find *actus quartus, scena prima*, and *actus quintus*. *All's Well* is divided only into acts; *The Winter's Tale* into acts and scenes. The "histories" are all divided in full, except *Henry V.* (Acts), 1 *Henry VI.* (decidedly "mixed"), 2 *Henry VI.* and 3 *Henry VI.* (not divided at all).

Of the "Tragedies," *Coriolanus*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *Julius Cæsar* are divided only into acts; *Macbeth*, *Lear*,

*Othello* and *Cymbeline* into acts and scenes; *Troilus* and *Cressida*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Antony and Cleopatra* into neither. In *Hamlet* three scenes of Act I. and two of Act II. are marked, the remainder of the play having no division whatever.

The only plays in the Folio which have lists of *dramatis personæ* (in every instance at the end) are *The Tempest*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Winter's Tale*, *2 Henry IV.*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Othello*. In *2 Henry IV.* and *Timon* a full page, with ornamental head-piece and tail-piece, is given to this list of "The Actors' Names." The omission in the twenty-nine other plays cannot be due to want of space, as an examination of the book will show. In several instances an entire page is left blank at the end of a play.

VII.—Mistakes owing to dictation—Blunders of the ear.

Furness (preface to *Love's Labour's Lost*, p. 6) surmises that the compositors, sometimes at all events, had the text read aloud to them instead of having it before them to look at, and Clark and Aldis Wright in the Clarendon Press edition of *Macbeth* say:—

"Probably it was printed from a transcript of the author's MS., which was in great part not copied from the original, but written to dictation. This is confirmed by the fact that several of the most palpable blunders are blunders of the ear and not of the eye."

This theory does not, however, command universal acceptance. Pollard (Introduction to "Facsimiles," p. 132) says:—

"It is much simpler to believe that misprints of the class which the theory is introduced to explain were caused by compositors trying to carry too many words at a time in their heads, and reproducing the impression of sound which they had formulated, instead of the sense."

I am not concerned to advocate either theory, but the following may probably be instances of the type of error referred to :

(a) *Henry the Fifth* ; Folio, p. 87 ; IV., iv., 38, *asture* for *à cette heure*.

(b) *Henry the Fifth* ; Folio, p. 79 ; III. iv. 7, *il & appelé* for *il est appelé*. This looks as if when the reader said *est* (is) the compositor thought of *et* (and), and therefore used the sign &.

(c) *Macbeth* ; Folio, p. 134 ; I. v. 26, High thee hither, for Hie thee hither.

VIII.—*Duplication of matter.*

(a) Rolfe says (p. 501) :

“The wretched editing—or want of editing—in the Folio is also shown in the retention of matter for which the author had substituted a revised version. . . .” A notable example of such duplication of matter occurs in *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV. 3 (see page 163 above).

At page 163 he says :—

“In Biron's long speech we have these lines :—

“For when would you, my lord—or you—or you—  
Have found the ground of study's excellence  
Without the beauty of a woman's face ?  
From women's eyes this doctrine I derive :  
They are the ground, the books, the academes,  
From whence doth spring the true Promethean fire.”

“For where is any author in the world  
Teaches such beauty as a woman's eye ?  
Learning is but an adjunct to ourself,  
And where we are our learning likewise is ;  
Then when ourselves we see in ladies' eyes,  
Do we not likewise see our learning there ?  
O, we have made a vow to study, lords,  
And in that vow we have forsworn our books.”

This belongs to the play as first written. . . . It re-appears in the revision of the speech thus :—

“For when would you, my liege,—or you,—or you,—  
In leaden contemplation have found out  
Such fiery numbers as the prompting eyes  
Of beauty's tutors have enrich'd you with ?

Never durst poet touch a pen to write  
Until his ink were temper'd with Love's sighs ;  
O, then his lines would ravish savage ears  
And plant in tyrants mild humility !  
From women's eyes this doctrine I derive.  
They sparkle still the right Promethean fire ;  
They are the books, the arts, the academes,  
That show, contain, and nourish all the world,  
Else none at all in aught proves excellent.  
Then fools you were these women to forswear,  
Or keeping what is sworn, you will prove fools.  
For wisdom's sake, a word that all men love,  
Or for love's sake, a word that loves all men,  
Or for men's sake, the authors of these women,  
Or women's sake, by whom we men are men,  
Let us once lose our oaths to find ourselves,  
Or else we lose ourselves to keep our oaths.”

(b) Returning to page 502, Rolfe says :

“Again, in the last scene of *Timon of Athens*, the epitaph of the misanthrope reads thus (except in spelling) in the Folio :—

“Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft ;  
Seek not my name. A plague consume you wicked caitiffs left !  
Here lie I, Timon, who, alive, all living men did hate  
Pass by and curse thy fill, but pass and stay not here thy gait.”

We have here the *two* epitaphs given in North's *Plutarch* as follows :

“Now it chanced so, that the sea getting in, it compassed his tomb round about, so that no man could come to it; and upon the same was written this epitaph :—

“ Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft ;  
 Seck not my name : a plague consume you wicked wretches  
 left.’ ”

It is reported that Timon himself when he lived made this epitaph ; for that which is commonly rehearsed was not his, but made by the poet Callimachus :—

‘ Here lie I Timon, who alive all living men did hate ;  
 Pass by and curse thy fill ; but pass, and stay not here thy  
 gait.’ ”

Shakespeare cannot have meant to use both epitaphs. He seems to have written both in the manuscript while hesitating between them, and afterwards to have neglected to strike one out.”

(c) Another instance occurs in *Romeo and Juliet*, Folio, p. 60, II., iii. 1, as to which I quote the following from Mrs. Gallup’s Preface to *Anne Boleyn*, p. iii. :—

“ Romeo, speaking, says :

“ ‘ The gray ey’d morne smiles on the frowning night,  
 Checkring the Easterne clouds with streakes of light,  
 And darknesse flecke’d like a drundard reeles,  
 From forth dayes pathway, made by Titans wheeles.’ ”

“ Then almost immediately after the Friar gives the same lines, with very slight but distinctive changes :

“ ‘ The gray ey’d morne smiles on the frowning night,  
 Checkring the Easterne cloudes with streaks of light,  
 And fleckled darknesse like a drunkard reeles,  
 From forth daies path, and Titans burning wheeles.’ ”

“ The modern editors cut out one *quatrain* as a supposed mistake, the decipherer discovers by the keys and joining words that each has a place—the first in one work and the second in another.”

It will be observed that Mrs. Gallup asks us to regard the apparent duplication as not accidental but intentional !

IX.—*Mistakes in the headings.*

(a) *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Pages 37 and 38 in the Folio are headed *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

(b) Mr. Pollard, in his bibliographical introduction to the Facsimile Folios says (p. 134), “. . . As a good example we may take the first sixteen pages of *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth*, which are interesting also for another reason. It will be found that on page 75 a roman n has found its way among the italic of the word *second*. On page 78 this word is quite regular, but the serifs at the foot of the *P* in *Part* are broken off. On pages 79, 81, 83, 85, 87 we continue to find the wrong fount n in *second*; on pages 80, 82, 84, 86 we continue to find the defective *P* in *Part*. Clearly, then, these headlines were not set up afresh for each page, but were transferred from forme to forme, or were left in the forme and the new letterpress placed below them.”\*

If Mr. Pollard's conclusion is right (and it appears to be well founded) it is an awkward one for Mrs. Gallup's cipher, as that obviously involves the setting up of each headline afresh.

The same, or a similar, defective *P* may be observed in the head-lines to pages 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117 and 119 of the *First Part of Henry VI.*, and there are many instances where a letter identifiable by some peculiarity may be seen to recur in a succession of pages with odd or with even numbers, as the case may be. These instances support Mr. Pollard's conclusion.

(c) *Taming of the Shrew*; Folio, p. 218, *Actus Tertia*, and *Love's Labour's Lost*; Folio, p. 135, *Actus Quartus*, instead of *Actus Quintus*.

The number and the nature of the errors, and their effect in sometimes hindering, sometimes preventing, the printed page from fulfilling its object of conveying to us the words and thoughts of the author, force us, I think,

\* My italics.

to the conclusion that the question with which this Article commenced—Did Bacon correct the proofs of the First Folio?—must be answered in the negative.

This conclusion in no way militates against the view that he revised and added to the text up to the last moment before the copy went to the printer, or against the view that the decision to bring out the Folio was his decision, and that the general direction and control were in his hands, and I do not apply it to the preliminary leaves.

It does, however, put a difficulty in the way of accepting Mrs. Gallup's "deciphered" matter; for if Bacon had inserted the biliteral cypher in the Folio, he would have had to read and correct the proofs, at least as regards the italics, not merely with the ordinary attention of an author, but with extraordinary attention to every letter, distinguishing between forms of the same letter, in many cases almost indistinguishable. And it is a difficulty in the way of alleged Baconian "signatures" and anagrams, if they would have required Bacon's personal correction of the proofs.

G. B. ROSHER.

---

## DID BACON DIE IN 1626?

**M**RS. POTT urged that he did not (BACONIANA, 1904). The late Mr. Bompas, M.A., wrote a short article disagreeing with Mrs. Pott (BACONIANA, 1904). Mrs. Buntin, in view of some doubt expressed by me as to Bacon's place of sepulture, contributed an article in BACONIANA of October last in support of the usually accepted view.

Being thus led to closely study the point for the first time, I find myself drifting to the opinion that the surmise that Bacon did not die in 1626 is justifiable.

## CAUSES CONDUCTING TO A FEIGNED DEATH.

1. Bacon was eager for the cloistered life. In his letter to Burleigh, of 1592, he remarked, "the contemplative planet carrieth me away wholly."

There were other remarks at various stages of his life to the same effect. When made Viscount, he wrote, "I may now be buried in St. Albans habit as he lived."

2. His marriage had proved a failure. In 1616 Chamberlain wrote of Lady Bacon, "She affords him no manner of comfort, either by her consort or her company."

In 1625 she appears to have been living apart from him in the parish of St. Martins-in-the-Fields, being there pressed for payment of certain parish expenses.

3. The death of James I. on 27th March, 1625, was a serious blow to Francis. James I. had done much to soften the punishments and degradations imposed upon Francis by the House of Peers in May, 1621. The loss of the revenues of the offices of Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor had left him with a crushing burden of debt, only kept in check by the £40,000 fine assigned to trustees for his benefit, and which as a Crown debt had priority.

4. Charles I. was not friendly to him. When he saw Bacon's coach surrounded by gentlemen on horseback as a guard he had remarked, "This man scorns to go out like a snuff."

5. Francis could only partially satisfy his creditors, even if he divested himself of all his property, such as would take place at death, and he was just enough to desire that they should have all they could as soon as practicable.

6. Great place was no longer open to him; his control of public affairs had dropped from his grasp, and the desire to spend the last years of his life in utter retirement amongst his books must have grown strong.



Some means of escape from an intolerable position had to be found. The notion of suicide was repugnant. In *Hamlet* at an earlier crisis in his career he had set himself against self-slaughter. He had discussed in 1 Henry IV. the subject of counterfeiting death. Said Falstaff:—

“But to counterfeit dying when a man thereby liveth is to be no counterfeit, but the true and perfect image of life indeed.”

7. His private letters in the autumn and winter of 1625—6 show that his health was improved and he was in a merry mood. This points to a mind made up and at ease.

#### CERTAIN OCCURRENCES.

Francis had died in 1592 as “Watson,” and also as “Greene.” In 1598, as “Spenser”; in “1623” as “Shakespeare.” Why not as “Bacon” in 1626? It was no more his real name than the others.

In December, 1625, Francis wrote out another Will. Carefully considered, it reads less like a Will, and more like a Valedictory Statement. The Trustees of the £40,000 fine are directed to withdraw their claims to priority, so that his general creditors could obtain all the benefits available by the winding-up of his estate. The history of his financial provision for his wife is set out, showing that he had behaved and intended to behave fairly to her. All the benefits he had proposed for her are detailed with exactitude, and, subsequently, in the Will, revoked, instead of being struck out. The pension which James I. had granted to him is recorded to show that he had not lost the Royal favour. The original Will is not now amongst the Public Records, having been delivered out on 30th July, 1627 (Spedding, Vol. VII., page 539).

The charge for his funeral was not to exceed £300, so that a considerable expenditure under this head (in

money of that day) was within the powers of the executors had the "Will" been other than valedictory statement. The great charm of this investigation is in the revelation of the completeness and neatness of Bacon's preparations for "retirement."

As Mr. Spedding commented, "In him the gift of seeing in prophetic vision what might be, and ought to be, was united with the practical talent of devising means and handling details."

During 1625 he was slowly *dying*, but only in the print of the Apophthegms and of the Psalm translations. Then came the elaborate Will. Early in 1626 Francis went from Gorhambury House to his Gray's Inn residence. Neither place was suitable to "die" in. The people about were not all members of his secret literary Protestant and scientific fraternity.

Upon Highgate Hill, remote from London, was a summer residence, so situated that a good look-out could be kept for any approaching intruder. (It is described in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1828.) It belonged to the Earl of Arundel, an old friend of considerable intellectual ability, and the first great English patron of fine arts. I suspect Arundel was a member of the Rosy Cross fraternity. The biography of him in "Encyclopædia Britannica" indicates his close association with other men of that group. From early in 1625 until June, 1626, Arundel was a prisoner in the Tower. The Highgate summer residence was in charge of a man as caretaker. Francis went there to "die." It is interesting to note that of the three persons whose names were afterwards associated (by Royal Society writers) with the "death event," two, Dr. Witherbourne and Dr. Parry) were prominent physicians, and the third, Sir Julius Cæsar, was son of Queen Elizabeth's Italian physician.

Amongst Toby Matthews' collection of Bacon's

papers is said to have been a document headed "The Lord St. Albans to the Earl Marshall, with humble thanks for a favour." It is as follows:—

"To the Earl of Arundel and Surry [*sic.*].

"My very good Lord,

"I was likely to have had the fortune of Caius Plinius, the Elder, who lost his life by trying an experiment about the burning of the mountain Vesuvius. *For I was also desirous to try an experiment or two touching the conservation and induration of bodies.* As for the experiment itself, it succeeded excellently well; but in the journey (*between London and Highgate*), I was taken with such a fit of casting as I knew not whether it were the stone or some surfeit, or cold, or, indeed, a touch of all three. But when I came to your Lordship's house I was not able to go back, and therefore was forced to take up my lodging here, where your housekeeper is very careful and diligent about me; which I assure myself your Lordship will not only pardon towards him, but think the better of him for it. For, indeed, your Lordship's house was happy to me; and I kiss your noble hands for the welcome which I am sure you give me to it, etc. I know how unfit it is for me to write to your Lordship with any other hand than mine own; but, in truth, my fingers are so disjointed with this fit of sickness that I cannot steadily hold a pen."

Whether it was necessary or not to write to a prisoner in the Tower such a long flowing *letter of apology*, one can, at any rate, marvel at the vigour which the invalid still possessed.

Although Francis enjoyed "dissimulation in reasonable use" (see *Essays*), he was not in the habit of telling lies.

He states in the Arundel letter that he *nearly lost his life in trying an experiment or two touching the conservation and induration of bodies, but that the experiment succeeded excellently well.* The ineffable and untrustworthy Aubrey, who flourished 1626—1697, relates a tale of stuffing a hen with snow; another biographer has

it that Bacon was put in a damp bed and caught a chill. No experiment such as the conservation of a fowl's body from decomposition could have succeeded by the presumed date of Bacon's letter. Besides, in the "History of Life and Death," 1622, he had already discoursed upon the preservative effect of extreme cold. No. The experiment alluded to in the letter concerned the conservation of Bacon's own body whilst in a state of induration, or, in other words, deprived of sensibility. That is to say, the medical gentlemen who accompanied him, or were summoned to Highgate, gave him an opiate and tricked him out as dead for the candle-lit inspection of the simple-minded male caretaker, and doubtless subsequently removed the "body" to the "utter retirement" of the house of Sir Julius Cæsar, mentioned by Lodge, the latter's biographer. Means of final escape could then be matured. The Arundel letter, which has neither signature nor date, must have been written, not at Highgate, but *ex-post facto*, and handed to friend Toby Matthew to show round. Francis was no doubt perfectly correct in his statement as to his nearly losing his life in trying the experiment. Medical men in that day were not greatly skilled in the use of opiates, and very likely had difficulty in restoring his sensibility. Correctly appreciated, the statements in Bacon's Arundel letter are true in substance and in fact. The precise date when the ceremony of "dying" was enacted we cannot fix. It may have taken place on the 9th April or some earlier date.

It is clear that by 10th April a report of his death was generally circulated. A chorus of poets wrote Latin dirges of sorrow, a careful selection of them being published by Rawley before the year was out.

Wolstenholm, the rich farmer of Customs, fearful for a £1,000 loan, tried to obtain a charging order on Bacon's pension, but failed. In 1627 Bacon's estate

was administered under Letters of Grant, and Wolstenholm and the other creditors obtained about eight shillings in the pound.

All these last mentioned happenings are equally consistent with actual death as with generally presumed death. The significant blanks in this business are the *absence of any register of burial*, and the complete *absence of any account or record of a funeral*.

If the administrators paid any funeral expenses they would have been shown in their printed accounts. But there is no item for "funerals." The greatest genius of his age, beloved by all who knew him, *placed in the ground silently*. None so poor to do him reverence. This is inexplicable, unless we have to do with a cleverly planned escape.

It was not entirely wise for Rawley to undertake the work of a biographer. If it be necessary to write an exterior account which is not a correct one, a clergyman with fears about his future state, is an unfit person to discharge the duty. The "Life of Lord Bacon" printed by Rawley in 1657 is a reverent account of a master who of course was then dead. But Rawley does the work with much hesitancy. Important matters are left out. Rawley finds it necessary to preface that he *would not tread too near upon the heels of truth*. He cannot bring himself to say that Francis was born in the royal palace of Whitehall, but confuses Yorke Place (the old name of Whitehall) with York House. When he has to name the day when Francis "died," he finds it convenient to name the one day of the year when is commemorated *the death and rising from the dead* of the Saviour. If Francis feigned death, then he could metaphorically be said to have died and risen from the dead. Possibly an interior story giving the true facts is contained in a cipher formed out of the capitals and shredding commas to which,

when reading the 1657 "Life," Professor Arber took so much exception.

"But what about the monument at St. Michael's Church?" some Alice in Wonderland may ask. "You cannot have a monument without a tomb?" I take temporary refuge in the vestibule of the 1623 Shakespeare Folio.

"Thou art a moniment without a tombe.  
And art alive still."

I agree there was a monument, and think something heavy was placed in a tomb at St. Michael's, Gorham-bury, and represented to be the body of Francis Bacon.

An opinion has been more than once hazarded that the inscription on the latter monument has been re-cut. It states that Bacon sat in the manner shown in the statue, and that after he had unfolded all natural wisdom and secrets of civil life he fulfilled the law of nature. The monumental inscription is therefore non-committal.

The 1656 History, quoted by Mrs. Bunten, is a good find. It should be worth buying for the interesting interior story it doubtless ciphers—not necessarily in biliteral.

Its exterior story indicates that when the body of Sir Thomas Meautys was interred below the pews of St. Michael's it was deemed prudent that a Rosy Cross savant should watch the preparation of the site, and prevent any accidental disclosure of the fact that Bacon's body was not there. The performance with the skull of some poor Yorick would confirm the local gravediggers in their impression that Bacon's body *did* lie there.

The cool manner in which Fuller, another Rosy Cross man, refers to the incident confirms my view.

The Trotter 1779 record of examination of the Bacon vault (some time about 1746, the date when the Stratford

effigy was repaired) is also very instructive. Some lead, "*taking somewhat the form of the body,*" was brought out. If the parochial dependent who told the narrative had examined the dust enclosed there, I think no human remains would have been found.

Even the shaped lead has long since disappeared. Search in the crypts as far back as 1851 revealed no remains of Francis Bacon. So reported the late Earl Verulam to Mrs. Pott. So reported another searcher, Mr. De la Poer Kennedy, a St. Albans contributor to *Notes and Queries*, though his report was probably to a London or local newspaper.

Circumstances subsequent in date to 1626 go to confirm the view that Francis was alive after that year. The first was a blunder made by Rawley in the "*Sylva Sylvarum*" of 1627. He wrote his Preface referring to Lord St. Alban in the present tense, as if he were alive; so blundering Rawley perhaps knew he was, and had to correct his blunder in a side note:—"This is the same which should have appeared had his Lordship lived." But surely this was another blunder, as *had his Lordship been alive he would have written his own Preface*. Mrs. Pott mentioned a book with a piece to Lord St. Alban "in his retirement, 1629." This is corroborative, unless it can be explained away as figurative or due to typographical error. Then the biographer of Sir Julius Cæsar affirms that Bacon wrote many valuable works in *utter retirement at the house of Sir Julius*.

The testimony of the "*Manes Verulamiani,*" printed 1626, is very confusing. Certain literary and clerical friends mourn in print as though they believed the great Verulam to be dead. Those of them we know to have been intimate friends were Sir William Boswell (literary executor), Rawley, the private chaplain, and the Revd. George Herbert. It should be helpful to note their

respective laments. Boswell expresses himself feelingly, but he was out of England, as resident minister at The Hague. Rawley merely refers to "the loss," a singularly placid expression from one so devoted. All Herbert ventured to write was: "It is evident that in April alone you could have died."

This allusion to the re-birth or resurrection of nature may have been a permissible subterfuge. Of the remainder, one startles us by asserting: "He is gone—is gone, but I will not say he is dead." Another is bold enough to exclaim: "Think you foolish traveller that the leader of the Choir of the Muses and of Phœbus is interred in cold marble? Away. You are deceived!" True, he qualifies this by adding that the Verulam star now glitters in ruddy Olympus, and so on, but even the qualification is ambiguous. One more ventures upon: "I think that if he comes not back to us neither will gifts like these be seen again."

The dirges are consistent with the proposition that some believed Francis to be dead, and that others knew he was not dead, and nervously trimmed their verses.

It was an era of planned mystification. Until researchers are prepared with a disrespectful unwillingness to be ensnared by innocent-looking surface statements in the printed books of the period, the interesting secrets therein embedded will not be brought to light.

Why Thomas Powell, in the "Attorney's Academy" of 1631, permitted himself still to address Francis as though he were living is another puzzling question:—

"Oh give me leave to pull the curtain by  
That hides thy worth in such obscurity."

HERMES is said to be another name for MERCURY, the messenger of the gods. The ancients attributed him to be the first inventor of secret means of communication.



Hermes Stella was a sub-title associated by Francis with one of his early drafts. I feel certain that Francis wrote the introduction signed "H. S." to the 1593 "Arcadia."

We learn from the bi-literal decipher that he wrote tales and plays under the name of "Greene." In "Greene's Funerals," 1594, "Greene" was alluded to in complimentary lines, of which the following is one:—

"For flueut tongue, for eloquence, men MERCURY him deemed."

On the point of whether Francis was alive after 1626, two seventeenth century books referring to MERCURY seem to throw a little light.

The first, called the "Repertoire of Records," was anonymous. It bore date 1631, and has been since attributed to the Thomas Powell above mentioned and also to Arthur Agarde. Mr. W. E. Clifton, who owns one of the few copies now extant, drew my attention to its curious verse dedication. I give part of it:—

"TO THE UNKNOWN PATRON.

This work I did intend to MERCURY  
 Before his wings were sick and he could fly :  
 But now the gods incensed, all together  
 Have lay'd diseases upon every feather.  
 Alas, he cannot raise himself *nor* carry  
*His plumes, as does the rest of all the Ayrie :*  
*But is retired to some shady Grove*  
*To hide him from the great incensed Jove.*  
 And where to find my Patron to deliver  
 This little worke of mine ; I know not, neither  
 If he were found (and no discretion lost)  
 This title might offend him, or me most."

The dedication concludes:—

"And tell him thou camst from an unknown friend  
 Whose love's a circle round without an end."

This is a very plain hint at cipher, and seeing that

directions about a figure cipher have been discovered in it by Mr. Clifton, and references to sealed bags of secret papers, there is no doubt it is a very important book.

Further on he refers to the same patron as "The great Master of this Myserie." (¶. ¶).

The other book is "MERCURY, or the Swift and Secret Messenger," dated 1641, with an initial verse on the most learned MERCURY the younger.

It has a dedication to Lord Berkeley, initialled by "J. W." his chaplain. "The Anatomy of Melancholy," 1621, was also dedicated to Berkeley. We know that "J. W." was John Wilkins, afterwards Bishop of Chester, a member of the Invisible College and a founder of the Royal Society, yet the book contains a verse :

" TO THE UNKNOWN AUTHOR.

By hiding who thou art seek not to miss  
The glory due to such a work as this."

I am tolerably satisfied by the 287 count that the four works: (1) "Discovery of a New World," (2) "Earth a Planet," (3) "Mercury," and (4) "Mathematical Magick," which after Wilkins' death were put down to Wilkins' authorship, are connected in some curious way with Bacon, also styled "Francis Rosicrosse," "Mercury," and "Learned Verulam." The man who wrote the dedication to "Mercury" wrote the dedication in "Venus and Adonis," 1593. Of this I feel assured.

There is a reference in "Resuscitatio," 1671, to Bacon having made "a holy and humble retreat into the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest." (Address to the Reader, 2nd part).

Mrs. Pott was assured by a Rosicrucian friend that Bacon died in Germany. This may account for the remarkable frontispiece to the German edition of

Bacon's acknowledged works and for the portraits of him in the "Bornitius Emblem Book" of 1659, also printed in Germany.

If he did live after 1626, he would have had further opportunity for hiding books and MSS. already hinted at in the "Manes" :—"*Pars sepulta Jacet.*"

This may restore the status of the 1638 "Arcadia" as containing ciphered instructions by Francis (at present ineffectively studied) for finding out some of them.

If, as I believe, the "Spenser" Tomb was placed in Westminster Abbey in 1620 for the eventual reception of the earthly remains of Francis Bacon, the inscription upon the tomb ought to help as to knowledge of the year of death. Owing to it having been "restored," the inscription on the tomb itself is of no use. Mr. Cuninghams's valuable researches lead me to infer that the dates of birth and death were at first left out of the "In Memoriam" inscription. So we may turn with more confidence to the inscription as given in the "tomb" frontispiece in the 1679 edition of the "Spenser" poems. The dates there supplied are—born 1510, died 1596.

The publication of this edition and the restoration to it of the line :—

"Now he is dead and lyeth wrapt in lead"

is indicative not only that Francis was dead, but that his body had obtained sepulture suitable to this great though unrecognised Prince of the House of Tudor. The dates may be intended to indicate ambiguously his age at death, viz., 86, which consequently had occurred in the year 1646. So the grave of the obscure Tudor, at the foot of the Shakespeare statue in Westminster Abbey, most likely contains the body of Francis Bacon. The official Abbey Catalogue tells us this obscure Tudor sought sanctuary in the Abbey.

If events did occur such as I have detailed it would

be correct to say that Francis Bacon did seek sanctuary within the walls of that old and sacred edifice.

These considerations deter me from accepting as final the adduced "proofs" that Bacon actually died in 1626.

PARKER WOODWARD.

## BACON AND PORTUGAL.

WE have the authority of the French biography in "La Vie Naturelle," published at an earlier date than any English one, for believing Francis travelled in Spain. Surely it behoves Baconians to investigate when he was there, what were the experiences, the results, of his visit? If we turn to his "State of Christendom," written 1580, we find this:

"The King of Spain, Philip, son to Charles V., about 60 years of age, a prince of great understanding, subtle and aspiring, diligent and cruel. . . . His last attempt on Portugal deserveth exact consideration. . . . He worketh on the foundation his father laid to erect monarchy, the which, if he succeed in the conquest of Portugal, he is likely to achieve unless death do cut him off.

"He maintaineth galleys to the amount of 140, whereof there are 60 in Portugal.

"He hath kept France in continual broil. . . . At this present, the King is about to restore Don Antonio, King of Portugal, whereto are great levies and preparation. . . . Don Antonio, elect King of Portugal, thrust out by the King of Spain, of 45 years of age, sober and discreet, is now in France, where he hath levied soldiers, whereof part are embarked, hoping by the favour of that king, and the goodwill the Portugals do bear him, to be restored again."

On 30th January, 1580, Henry, Cardinal, King of Portugal died, at which time neither Francis or England generally knew Portugal's wishes with regard to its future sovereign. Later in 1580, Francis in "The State

of Christendom" shows considerable knowledge of and interest in Portugal and Don Antonio. Speaking confidently of Portugal's views with regard to that Prince he says :

"Beside in his person his election to be noted with the title he claimeth very singular, and seldom the like seen, being chosen of all the people."

It is a fact of no small moment that among Anthony Bacon's private papers we find the clue to Francis' knowledge of Portugal's affairs, though, like the diplomatist he was, Francis placed a finger on his lip and kept all the details secret that Anthony's note discovers. Thomas Birch in his "Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth" ("British Museum," Vol. I., p. 14), gives the substance of a paper which he found among Anthony Bacon's correspondence, entitled :

"A note of special services performed by Edward Burnham for Her Majesty at the commandment of the Right Honorable Sir Francis Walsingham, Knt., Her Majesty's principal Secretary, and My Honorable Master." The paper gives details of an embassy undertaken by Burnham in France in the year 1577 (the year Francis first went to France) for the Queen and Walsingham, which secret journey was performed before the Duke of Anjou made his first voyage to the Low-Countries, after which Mr. Burnham returned to England with a relation of the "State of things agreeable to the Secretary's instructions, with which both he and the Queen herself (as Anthony takes the trouble to tell), were extremely satisfied."

It is most important to note that Sir Amyas Paulet wrote in the latter part of 1577 to Sir Nicholas Bacon to tell him his son was safe and sound and in good health after a perilous journey! [See "Bacon in France," BACONIANA, Vol. IX., p. 53]. He rejoices

much that Francis has safely passed the "brunt" of it, and has proved himself worthy of his father's favour! He alludes to the troubles in the Low-Countries, and says that it "is not certainly known yet what course France means to pursue"; showing clearly that as yet the Duke of Anjou had not made his fresh voyage there. It was exactly at this time that Edward Burnham had been sent by Walsingham's order into Picardy, to Calais, Boulogne, Montreuil, Abeville and Amiens to see and learn what French forces were there levied to enter the Low Countries, passing through Licques, where he had a conference with Monsieur de Licques, and another conference with Monsieur de la Motte, Governor of Graveling.

Sir Amyas' report to the Queen by Francis in March, 1578, with regard to his political work is most "Commendatory," coming from a man of great note in his time for political wisdom and abilities. "Of great hope, endowed with many and singular parts, one, who, if God gave him life would prove a very able and sufficient subject to do Her Highness good and acceptable service" (State Paper Office, French Correspondence, Spedding, Vol. I., p. 8).

Rawley himself tells us at this particular time Francis accomplished in France some work political given him to do "with great applause," and "returned to France again with intention to continue for some years there." Anthony Bacon further acquaints us with the fact that Mr. Burnham, after handing in his report to high quarters, was despatched to Sir Amyas Paulet to Paris, and thence to Rheims, to see "what ill-affected subjects of her Majesty were there." After which, disguised as a cornet of horse to an Italian gentleman in Paris, he sought the protection of his friend, a nobleman in the camp of Don John, of Austria, then besieging Limburg, and continued there fifteen days,

till that city was taken, after which he reported on the state of that camp and the enemies' garrison to Lord Cobham and Walsingham then at Antwerp.

In October, 1578, he was sent to the camp of the Prince of Parma, his relation of how that Prince was liked by the nobility being approved by the Queen and Walsingham. Bacon in his "State of Christendom" mentions this Prince Alexander as then acting "General in the Low Countries to the King of Spain," but makes no further remark about him. In 1579, Francis went over to England on receiving the news of Nicholas Bacon's rather sudden death, of which he had a psychic announcement. In January he was still in England, and then as Anthony Bacon tells in his interesting special note, Cardinal Henry, King of Portugal, died, and Don Antonio, doubtful as to whether he or Philip II. was to be elected in his place, sent to Queen Elizabeth his ambassador, John Roderigo de Zenza, with the result that Edward Burnham was despatched at once to Portugal to report on the attitude of the Portugals. Perhaps it is not so very surprising that young Francis tells us confidently that: "all the people of Portugal chose Don Antonio as their King"; their country having been, as he says, "usurped by no other title than strength and vicinity."

He spoke by the card then, just as later in his "Discourse in praise of Queen Elizabeth" he shows intimate acquaintance with her policy in respect of Spain, saying how she foiled Philip's ambitions by the secret and prompt action she took in regard to them. The Low-Countries, he says in the same Discourse, "were warred upon by Spain because he seeketh . . . to plant there an absolute and martial government, and to suppress their liberties the like attempted . . . at Arragon." "It is her government and her government alone," he adds, "which hath left this proud nation from overrunning all."

Anthony Bacon gives most interesting details of Edward Burnham's dangerous quest in Portugal. Besides being a good linguist and gifted with qualities of secrecy, discretion, and bright intelligence, the messenger sent on that hazardous journey showed no little dramatic acumen, assuming characters at will so as to deceive the very elect.

In all these respects Francis shined. Take him all round the Queen could have found no better secret envoy than he. Walsingham was known to have a genius in his choice of "foreign intelligencers," and would surely not have overlooked the unique qualities of young Francis!

We must never lose sight of the actor in Francis. Mallet in his life of this extraordinarily gifted man, quotes Francis Osborne, who says: "In conversation, he [Francis] could assume the most differing characters, and speak the language proper to each, with a facility that was perfectly natural, for the dexterity of the habit concealed every appearance of art. A happy versatility of genius which all men wish to arrive at, and one or two once in an age are seen to possess." "Maturity of discretion and judgment," Mallet remarks, were also his special dower. What an expert in acting he was, especially when Ben tells us, "he accompanied what he spoke with all the expression and grace of action." Taking this side of him into consideration, the Portugal quest, though extremely dangerous, would have had for him endless fascination. What Baconians, of course, would wish to find, would be a relation of his experiences in Spain and Portugal. He who, in his *Essay of Travel*, so impressed on our minds to be sure and keep a diary when travelling, *must* have placed a record of this special journey somewhere safe, if he really took it. Mallet says, "the native bent of his mind strongly turned to reflection and enquiry suffered him not to stop short at



the study of languages, but led him to remark on the customs and manners of those that spoke them." If any reader connected with Spain and Portugal can help us in the search of a lost diary, may I earnestly implore them to do so?

From its romantic side this visit to Portugal would have appealed strongly to Francis. "The Gold of Guinea, the silks of Goa, the Spices of the Phillipines, made Lisbon one of the marts of the world," as Green, the Historian, tells us. The Queen's envoy continued in Lisbon twenty-two days, the danger of his adventure requiring him to assume the character of the servant to a factor of Mr. Bird, merchant. He may possibly have taken many disguises, for during the next three months he was continually exposed to danger, and was strictly examined at several places, particularly by Conde de Lemos, because news came out of Arthur Lord Grey, of Wilton, having put to the sword Spaniards who had landed in Ireland. Indeed he had no sooner embarked twelve hours on his return to England when orders arrived, from Philip of Spain, for his apprehension. It seems that Don Bernardo de Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador in England, had received intimation of this secret voyage to Portugal, and had sent over a description of the stature, countenance, and particular marks to know the Queen's envoy by, and so pierce his clever disguises. Was it from January, 1580, to June, that Francis Bacon travelled in Spain and Portugal under the very possible pseudonym of Edward Burnham? There was plenty of time, even allowing for the time a journey to Spain took in those days, for him to go, and stay some months, and return before carrying messages to Catherine de Medici and Henry III. in Paris, and joining Montaigne at Beaumont in September. The Conquest of Portugal, by Philip of Spain, at this time drew France and England into close relations, and

Catherine de'Medici hoped to unite the two countries by marriage of Elizabeth with the Duke of Anjou. I have already stated my reasons for believing that Francis had in 1577 been with John Sturm in Strasburg, under the name of *Edward* (BACONIANA, p. 85, Vol. VII.). A Mr. Burnham is mentioned in the "Sydney Papers," in "Collins' Letters and Memorials of State" (Vol. II., p. 302), and by Sir Dudley Digges in his "Complete Ambassador"; and by Sir Thomas Lake, Walsingham's amanuensis, in connection with Essex in 1599, who says that he could not send letters by Burnham because Essex sent him out of the way; which was just the time, curiously enough, that the Queen ordered Anthony Bacon away from Essex House. Essex was employing Anthony at that time in very extensive correspondence as the best intelligencer he could command for all parts. Francis' name was apparently rather a sacred one in high quarters, and silence and secrecy seems to have attached itself to it from early days. I sometimes go further and wonder whether Burnham was used as a pseudonym not only for Francis Bacon but for Anthony Bacon also when it was wanted? If any Baconians can add any light on this subject I shall be glad to receive it. I hope later to trace some connection between Spain's early dramatic literature and our own immortal plays. It seems more than likely that through Francis's personal connection with the peninsula the original form of *Twelfth Night* may have found its way from Spain and France to England!

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

## JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

*(Continued.)*

**I**N the October BACONIANA we gave several contemporary references to Lord Bacon's death and burial, and mentioned the desecration of his tomb by Dr. King on the occasion of the burial of Sir Thomas Meautys in the vault of St. Michael's Church. As Sir Thomas Meautys had been the confidential secretary of the Lord Chancellor, and his heir to the estate of Gorhambury, it devolved on us to try and find any reference he might have made to the loss of his friend and patron, and if he had touched on the great man's funeral, of which he must have had the arrangements. This necessitated a good deal of search, and the only reward came through the private correspondence of Jane, Lady Cornwallis, 1613 to 1644, from the original letters in possession of the family.

A few words here may be necessary to show Lady Cornwallis's connection with the Bacon family, and her friendship with Mr. Thomas Meautys, who was afterwards knighted. This lady was the daughter of Hercules Meautes, and his wife Phillippe (the latter being a daughter of Richard Cooke, of Gedeia Hall). She married, firstly, Sir William Cornwallis, and on becoming his widow, she consented to bestow her hand and considerable fortune on Nathaniel Bacon, ninth son of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, of Culford, in Suffolk, who was a son of Sir Francis Bacon's half-brother. She still continued to be called Lady Cornwallis after her marriage, until her husband, Nathaniel Bacon, was made a Knight of the Bath in January, 1625—6, when she assumed the name of Lady Bacon, or Lady Jane Bacon, and is thus addressed in letters from friends.

One of her most ardent admirers and a constant correspondent, was Thomas Meautys, former secretary to Sir

Francis Bacon. His letters to her are full of compliments, as was the fashion of the day, and contain very little news. This seems at last to have irritated Lady Bacon, who had plenty of brains, and managed her estate and fortune with great judgment, and she got impatient and desired Mr. Meautys to use a more condensed style in addressing her.

He complains of this, but has to comply with her wishes, and, unfortunately, at this very juncture, his patron and friend, Lord Chancellor Bacon, died, and he only ventures to barely mention the fact to the impatient lady, who must surely have come in contact with our philosopher at some time. Here is the letter, written towards the end of April, 1626.

MY EVER BEST LADY AND COSIN,—I am right gladd that I have found out at last, which I understood by yours received, the way and style to make my letters acceptable, which is, I perceave, by being short and making profession of my desire and happiness to contribute anything towards your health and welfare, which I doe as cordially effect now, as then, and shall ever doe the same while I am

T. MEAUTYS.

Your brother went for the Low Countries yesterday with hope to retourne some 6 weekes hence. His lady remaynes with my Lady Sussex. My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried.

In this one line he announces the death of the great man he is said to have loved and admired, and whose confidence he had enjoyed so thoroughly, and to whose estate of Gorhambury he was heir.

In his next letter we see that the death of Lord Bacon has not benefitted his purse, as he has to beg a loan from Lady Bacon.

Friday, May, 1626.

MY VERY BEST LADY AND COSIN,—I received yours by Mr. Proud this minute and purpose to write to you again by him. In the meantime I take the freedom to tell you that if upon the death of Mr. Cotton, of whose office in our Chamber I had a second reversion, I proceed, as I am in treaty to buy him out that is in possession, and so get it for 3 lives of my own name, when I will reckon upon your ladyship's purse to assist me with the loan of £600, for about that sum I must deposit at first, and

£300 more afterwards, which is the full rate I must for security. I will either make over the £200 per annum of my brother Glover's, the office itself, or any other security your counsel may advise, etc.

A third letter, dated April 16th, 1628, which was just two years after the death of Lord Bacon, gives us an insight to the trouble he is having in settling with the creditors of his former patron.

MY VERY BEST LADY AND COSIN,—Sir Thomas Meautys<sup>o</sup> and his lady are well, and hath invited me to come over and christen their childe, whereof I can yet return noe direct answer until I have settled some tearme business concerning my Lord St. Albans' creditors, etc.

It is to be remembered that letters of ministration had been granted to Sir Robert Rich and Thomas Meautys to settle Bacon's estate on July 18th, 1627, and it must have taken some years to disentangle the mess his affairs had got into, especially as the bribes the Lord Chancellor had been accused of taking from applicants had been claimed back by the latter against his estate as debts.

The friendship between Lady Bacon and Thomas Meautys is shown by her ladyship lending him money, and the tie was further strengthened by the marriage of her daughter Ann Bacon to him about 1637.

No doubt the marriage with this heiress raised the worldly position of Meautys, who was a man of immense energy and business organisation. He had been a member of Parliament for some years, and a Clerk of the "Council Extraordinary." He was knighted by Charles I. on February 16th, 1640—1. On his death in 1649 he left the estate of Gorhambury to his wife, who afterwards married Sir Harbottle Grimston.

\* Lady Bacon's brother of the same name, who was in the Low Countries.

This sketch of him is merely intended to show his reference to the death of Lord Bacon.

*A doubtful passage in Henry VII.*

One of Bacon's most popular books is certainly "Henry VII." It takes easy rank after the Essays, and has become an authority of historical value, and a reference book for the life of that Tudor prince, and we only wish that our philosopher had finished the histories, which he began, of both Henry VIII. and of the vigorous princess he knew and understood so well, Elizabeth, for, of course, the most reliable chronicles of monarchs are those which have been written during their life and times by a contemporary.

But as Bacon wrote "Henry VII." a hundred years after the events had occurred, let us glance at some of his authorities. He would naturally turn to the best-known historians such as Polydore, Vergil and Fabian, but he got many facts from Bernard André. It is rather astonishing to find that the principal annals of the reign of Henry VII., compiled by a *contemporary* subject, were put together by a blind Frenchman who came to England with Henry, and who dictated his chronicle in Latin to an amanuensis.

Bernard André, this blind historian and poet, has several interesting points in his own life. He was a favourite with the King, who made him his Poet Laureate, and in 1496 appointed him tutor to his eldest son, Prince Arthur. So this friar of St. Augustine from Toulouse became an important English subject, and his manuscript life of Henry VII., in Latin, Bacon had to consult, when wishing to remember some point for his English work. But the strange thing is that Bacon, either from haste, or carelessness, is sometimes not accurate in his reading of Bernard André's meaning, and has made one or two statements open to doubt.

It is evident that Bacon wrote the outline of his history a good many years before it appeared in print; and it was probably suggested by his own proximity to Henry VII.'s palace of Richmond, which was opposite his country residence in Twickenham Park. But he had no leisure to complete the chronicle until after his "fall" in 1621, when he devoted some months to finishing it off, and he sent the MS. to the King, hoping to conciliate James by begging a perusal, and correction of its pages, which that monarch graciously consented to do.

At an early period, a History of Great Britain was occupying the busy pen of John Speed (1552—1629), who published his work in 1611. In its pages are marginal notes giving the authority from which his facts are derived, and we see that three or four have been taken from "*Sir Fr. Bacon, frag. MS.*," and in describing the character of Henry VII., he does not give his own impression, but quotes bodily from our philosopher's MS., which he prefaces by "Now for the character of this famous wise prince (which with reason ought to be set in front of his actions as certain lights of mind by which to discern the fountain of councils and causes). A learned and eloquent knight, the principal lawyer of our time, gives many things of which these selected are very regardable."

He then quotes from the MS. which he has mentioned, and in this way we find that Bacon had written a good deal of his history of Henry VII. long before 1611.

Speed also had to consult Bernard André's MSS., and the fact becomes revealed that both he and Bacon make the same error in their translation of André's word, "*laetanter.*"

In giving the description of the first entry of Henry into London, Bacon writes, "The Mayor and Companies of the City received him at Shoreditch, whence

he entered the City, himself not being on horseback, or in any open chair or throne, but in a close chariot."

Speed, writing at the same time, is good enough to quote who his authority is, which our philosopher never condescended to do. He says:—

"Henry staid not in ceremonious greetings, for that, as Andreas hath said he entered covertly, meaning belike (likely) in a horse litter, or close chariot."

It is to be noted that both these historians announce that Henry was not on view, but in a closed chariot, but the passage in André's MS. does not express the word "covertly" at all, and the word which they have mistaken for "latenter (= secretly, privately), is really "laetanter" in the old MS., and means "gladly or joyfully."

Here is the passage in the original, which can be seen in the British Museum:— \*

*"De Regina Coronatione A.D. 1485.*

"Rex ipse Richmundiae comes Saturni luce quo etiam die de hostibus triumpharat, urbem Londinum magna procerum comitante caterva laetanter ingressus est. Ad cujus adventum ego, etsi oculis captus amore jampridem sui ac desiderio inflammatus astiti, laetusque poetico furore afflatus palam hoc carmen cecini."

It will be seen that a different meaning can be constructed from this Latin sentence, and it is more likely that Henry showed the people his satisfaction at finally entering into the kingdom he had so long aspired to, and fought so bravely for at Bosworth, than that he hid his person, as if afraid of an unknown enemy in the land he considered his own by right, and that was giving him a conqueror's welcome.

The conclusion to be drawn is that Bacon consulted

\* Bernard André's *Vita Henry VII.*, in Latin, is in the Cotton Library. Dom. XVIII. (ff. 126-228).



Speed's MS., as that history appeared in print in 1611, and Viscount St. Alban's volume (with its dedication to Prince Charles) not until 1622. In this dedication Bacon excuses himself for any shortcomings about the hero of Bosworth.

"I have not flattered him, but took him to life as well as I could, sitting so far off and having no better light."

A. C. BUNTEN.

---

### THE BORDEAUX COPY OF MONTAIGNE'S ESSAYS.

THE city of Bordeaux possesses a priceless copy of the 1588 edition of Montaigne's Essays. It is a large quarto volume, printed in Paris by Abel L'Angelier. It contains 496 pages without pagination. The margins are covered with notes of the author, many of which are clearly intended to be incorporated in a new edition. In one of these is found the veritable orthography of his name. It reads thus, "Compaigne, Espagne, Gascouinge, etc., mettez un I, comme à Montaigne." Upon the frontispiece of the volume the words "cinquiesme edition" have been effaced, and the words "sixiesme edition" have been substituted. Above the summary of the title page is written, "Viresque acquirit eundo," an epigram which appears for the first time on the title page of the 1600 Edition of the Essays. The most curious alteration is in the date of the address to the reader, which precedes the table of chapters contained in the book. In the print it is "12 Juin, 1588." This has been obliterated, and the date which appears on the first edition, published at Marseilles, substituted thus:—"1<sup>er</sup> Mars, mille cinq cent quatre vingt." The author desired to preserve the original date notwithstanding the considerable additions and alterations which had been made in the book.

The corrections, emendations and additions to the text which have been made in handwriting on the margins number between five and six hundred. It is said that the handwriting is generally of a neat character, of good orthography for the time, and of bold strokes, which demonstrate that the author transferred his thoughts to the paper as rapidly as he conceived them.

About one-third of these annotations were incorporated in the first posthumous edition, which was published by Mlle. de Gournay in 1595.

The foregoing particulars are taken from a letter dated 26th August, 1789, addressed to the Abbé de Fontenai, directeur of the *Journal Général de France*, which was published therein on the 12th of November, 1792. The volume had been known and referred to during the eighteenth century by residents of Bordeaux, but the literary world generally was in ignorance of its existence. The manuscript appears to have been deposited in loose leaves in a monastery. Anxious for the preservation of this valuable relic, which was then frequently being consulted, the monks caused it to be re-bound. It is to be regretted that in the binding many of the pages were cut down, and some of the notes were thus lost for ever.

Michel de Montaigne retired to his Chateau de Montaigne in 1571, after having sold his office as Councillor of the Parliament of Bordeaux. The solitude which he sought produced in him a spirit of melancholy, and it was to dissipate this that he turned to writing.

The first edition of the Essays was published in two books by Millanges, a printer of Bordeaux, in 1580. In the year 1582 a second edition was distributed by the same publisher. In this here and there the author corrected sentences and added some reflections, which relate

chiefly to his travels and to remedies for stone, a disease from which he suffered. It is here that he professed his complete submission to the Catholic Church. In 1584 R. Estienne and L'Angelier reprinted this edition in Paris, and again in 1587 it was republished by Jean Richer.

Between the years 1580 and 1588 the life of Montaigne passed through a complete change. He travelled in Germany, Switzerland and Italy; he passed four years as the Mayor of Bordeaux; he witnessed a renewal of the civil war, with its attendant anarchy and political passions. The result of these additional and varied experiences, Professor Strowski considers, is to be found in the Essays. The 1588 edition is greatly enlarged, and is extended by the addition of a third book. The additions are of importance. The chapters are rearranged, the sequence of ideas is varied, and there appears evidence, writes the Professor, of the existence of two inspirations, two problems and two men. The work is obscure to the reader who seeks in it, in vain, systematic thought, but it is richer, more varied and more profound than any of the preceding editions.

Montaigne did not cease to think and to live after 1588, *i.e.*, though his health condemned him to retirement, he continued to enrich his experience and develop his Essays. The testimony of the friends of his old age, Pierre de Brach and Florimond de Ræmond, bears evidence of the fulness of his resignation and gravity. The supreme moment for meditation had arrived. In these last years of his life he devoted himself to the augmentation and correction of his work. At his death, on the 15th of September, 1592, it was almost complete, but he did not live to see it printed in its final form. There is evidence that the notes were commenced *before* the 1588 edition was published, so that the sheets unbound must have been furnished to Montaigne whilst the volume was passing through the press.

The importance of this annotated example of the 1588 edition is recognised, and the town of Bordeaux has permitted its reproduction in phototype. It will be issued in three volumes, and comprise more than a thousand blocks of phototype. M. Fortunat Strowski, Professor of the Faculty of Letters at Paris, has written an introduction to it. A prospectus has been circulated inviting subscriptions,\* which is accompanied by a reproduction (Pl. I, 012) of one of the pages. The sheet is covered with annotations, chiefly consisting of additions to the text.

And now an assertion can be made with a feeling of certainty and confidence. *Every word of writing which appears on this page is from the hand of Francis Bacon.* The annotations of Bacon in books, which in recent years have been gathered together, varies considerably, but careful study of the various styles employed enable the investigator to recognise the same hand running through them. Spedding has commented on the changes which took place in Bacon's handwriting, and Edwin A. Abbott, speaking of the various styles of his composition, remarked, "Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting." The examples which are found on the reproduction of this page of the 1588 Essays are in Bacon's undisguised writing. The instances in which he annotated books in English or French are comparatively few. Latin, as in the case of Montaigne, was his mother tongue, and was the language he usually employed when writing in the margins of Greek, Hebrew, or Latin works. It is therefore difficult to make a comparison of actual words. Fortunately the page reproduced contains the words "Socrates" and "Socratique." There is a copy of Plato's works in Greek, published "Basilæ apud Henrichum Petri,"

\* Full particulars may be obtained from the Secretary of the Bacon Society, 11, Hart Street, E.C.

in which he has freely annotated in various styles of handwriting. The words "Socratis" and "Socrates" frequently occur in the margins. The following facsimiles will enable readers to judge for themselves how remarkable is the similitude between the two handwritings. In every characteristic they are identical, as will be seen from the following reproductions:—

FROM PLATO'S  
WORKS:—*Socratis**Socratus**Socrates**Socrates**Socratus**Socratus*FROM THE BORDEAUX  
1588 ESSAYS:—*Socras**Socrates**Socrates**Socrates**Socrates**Socrates**Socrates*

It will be observed that in each case the three first letters, Soc, are never joined together. In the Montaigne the c is not joined to the r, and the same peculiarity is found in specimens given from the Plato volume. Then in every case "rati" is written without taking off the pen.

This does not constitute proof that Bacon wrote Montaigne's Essays, but it does show conclusively that he

was concerned in their revision. What is now required is a careful examination of the editions of 1580, 1582, 1584, 1588, and of the copy prepared for the press for an edition in which it was intended to incorporate the manuscript notes, so that the evolution of thought and style may be followed. It is a work which should be undertaken by some French man of letters.

W. T. SMEDLEY.

[Since the foregoing notes were in type the writer has had an opportunity of making a thorough examination of the whole of the manuscript notes on the margins of the Bordeaux volume, and his opinion formed on an inspection of the specimen plate is confirmed. The greater portion if not the whole of the notes throughout the volume are in the handwriting of Francis Bacon. How or when they came there is another matter, but that most of them are from Bacon's pen is beyond question.]

---

#### DR. H. H. FURNESS ON DESDEMONA.

**B**EFORE the publication in the *Contemporary Review* (October, 1912) of the article on "The Character of Desdemona," by Mrs. Hinton Stewart, the MS. thereof had been placed in the hands of the late Dr. Horace Howard Furness, author of the "Variorum Edition of Shakespeare," by a mutual friend, Dr. Hull Platt, who has since also passed away. The latter handed over to the writer of the above-named article a letter from Dr. Furness, beginning thus:—

"Herewith I return Mrs. Stewart's MS., with many thanks for the pleasure I have had in reading it.

"To give more *strength* to Desdemona's character than is usually attributed to it is, I think, truly ad-

mirable, and adds much to the dramatic effect. Should this essay be published, no actress of the part could ever hereafter afford to overlook it."

When reading these words the writer had little hope that her essay, even with all the advantages afforded to it by its appearance in the *Contemporary Review*, could ever achieve such a far-reaching and, as it seemed to her, highly desirable result, or that a new conception was likely to obtain on the stage of this most exquisite of Shakespearean heroines.

Now, however, four years after the above letter was written by the distinguished Shakespearean scholar of Pennsylvania, an accepted English authority has for the first time pronounced in favour of Desdemona's *strength* of character. The Rev. Dr. Stopford Brooke in his "Ten More Plays of Shakespeare" (p. 177), published 1913, writes as follows:—

"Here [in the Council Chamber] for the first time we meet Desdemona, and she is a surprise. We expect to find her, like her father's description of her,

"A maiden never bold,  
Of spirit so still and quiet, that her motion  
Blushed at herself ;"

and we find her no such person. No one is more surprised than Brabantio at her dignity, her firm grasp of the situation, her unshrinking attitude before the Senate; not one at all of spirit so still and quiet that her motion blushed at herself. All these years he had never known her, no more than Lear had known his daughters. Love had not transformed her, but brought to the surface the deep powers of her nature—strength of loving, strength of will, firmness in act, clear vision of what to do in difficulty, as when she settled the question before the whole Senate of what she is to do when Othello leaves for Cyprus. She is frank and bold

and firm; not a girl, but a steadfast, clear-eyed woman. But in her boldness there is no immodesty. It is the boldness of deep love. It is the boldness of innocence. It is the boldness of one who is ignorant of the wrong and wickedness of the world, and this innocent boldness in her character accounts for the pleasant frankness of her conversation with Iago in the next Act, and for her natural relations with Cassio, and, alas, for the ease with which she slips into the net of Iago."

In reference to the quotation from Brabantio, Dr. Brooke writes in a footnote: "This description has been foolishly taken by many great actresses as the basis of their presentment of Desdemona. It is Brabantio's idea of her—not Shakespeare's."

One would willingly go still further than Dr. Brooke, and maintain once more that, in Shakespeare's intention, Othello's violence excites no fear in Desdemona's breast; that though, while he is courteous, she is all softness and sweet obedience, her brave spirit rises, fearless and undaunted, in opposition to his rage; that, during the handkerchief scene (III. iv.), her exclamations express scepticism and concern at his vehemence rather than alarm, and though she declines to admit that the kerchief is irretrievably lost, she asks:

"But what and if it were?"

a question than which, after all Othello has said about its magic power, nothing could be more daring; she dismisses him with the frank rebuke:

"In sooth you are to blame;"

afterwards describing herself to Emilia as a "warrior," an "unhandsome" one, who had not made sufficient allowance for the disabilities of the foe.

In the last scene of her life, when awakened from the sleep of innocence and exhaustion, she parleys with her



infuriated husband courageously and most wisely, though fully realising her danger; ever seeking, as opportunity offers, an explanation of his anger, till, at the name of Iago, the whole vile plot is revealed to her intensified and horrified soul, and her presence of mind is shattered; even then her entreaties for one short spell of life in which to prove her innocence are uttered only when her husband is in the act of smothering her in full conviction of her guilt.

However this may be, the time has surely now come when, in the words of Dr. H. H. Furness, "no actress of the part can hereafter afford" to ignore what, it can hardly be doubted, is a truer reading than the conventional one of this pure, gracious, yet most heroic character.

H. H. S.

---

## NEWMAN AND BACONIANISM.

THERE is a piece of Shakespeare criticism in Cardinal Newman's "Grammar of Assent" which shows that this great master of English prose might very well have been a great Baconian had he studied the question. "The Grammar of Assent" was published in 1870, before the greatest of modern literary controversies had attracted much attention; and it is the work of which the author is reported to have said much the same as Thackeray of "Esmond": "I stand by this book, and am willing to leave it, when I go, as my card."\* It is a book of peculiarly English mentality.

The passage with which we are concerned comes in as illustrating the inadequacy of strict logic for the proof of concrete subjects; the main contention being that "for genuine proof in concrete matter we require an

\* Field's "Yesterdays With Authors," p. 17.

*organon* more delicate, versatile and elastic than verbal argumentation" (p. 264).

I do not intend to give the whole criticism; only what will suffice to indicate what may be called Baconian tendencies of the illustrious author. On the above cited page he says: "I ought to give an illustration of what I have been stating in general terms; but it is difficult to do so without digression. However, if it must be, I look round the room in which I happen to be writing, and take down the first book which catches my eye. It is an old volume of a magazine of great name; I open it at random and fall upon a discussion about the then lately-discovered emendations of the text of Shakespeare. It will do for my purpose.

In the account of Falstaff's death in *Henry V* (Act II. scene iii.) we read, according to the received text, the well-known words, "His nose was as sharp as a pen, and 'a babbled of green fields." In the first authentic edition, published in 1623, some years after his death, the words, I believe, ran, "and a table of green fields," which has no sense. Accordingly an anonymous critic, reported by Theobald in the last century, corrected them to "and 'a talked of green fields." Theobald himself improved the reading into "and 'a babbled of green fields," which since his time has been the received text. But just twenty years ago an annotated copy of the edition of 1632 was found, annotated perhaps by a contemporary, which among as many as 20,000 corrections of the text, substituted for the corrupt reading of 1623, the words "on a table of green frieze," which has a sufficient sense, though far less acceptable than Theobald's. The genuineness of this copy with its annotations, as it is presented to us, I shall here take for granted.

Now I understand, or at least will suppose, the argument maintained in the article of the magazine in ques-

tion to run thus: "Theobald's reading, as at present received, is to be retained to the exclusion of the text of 1623, and of the emendation made on the copy of the edition of 1632—to the exclusion of the text of 1623, because that text is corrupt; to the exclusion of the annotation of 1632, because it is anonymous." I wish it, then, observed how many large questions are opened in the discussion which ensues, how many recondite and untractable principles have to be settled, and how impotent is logic, or any reasonings which can be thrown into language, to deal with these indispensable first principles.

The first position is, "The authoritative reading of 1623 is not to be allowed in the received text, because it is corrupt." Now, are we to take it for granted as a first principle which needs no proof, that a text may be tampered with because it is corrupt? However the corrupt reading arose, it is authoritative. It is found in an edition published by known persons only six years after Shakespeare's death, from his own manuscript as it appears, and with his corrections of earlier faulty impressions. Authority cannot sanction nonsense, but it can forbid critics from experimentalizing upon it. If the text of Shakespeare is corrupt, it should be published as corrupt.

I believe the best editors of the Greek tragedians have given up the impertinence of introducing their conjectures into the text; and a classic like Shakespeare has a right to be treated with the same respect as Æschylus. To this it will be replied that Shakespeare is for the general public and Æschylus for students of a dead language; that the run of men read for amusement or as a recreation, and that if the editions of Shakespeare were made on critical principles they would remain unsold. Here, then, we are brought to the question whether it is any advantage to read Shakespeare except

with the care and pains which a classic demands, and whether he is in fact read at all by those whom such critical exactness would offend ; and thus we are led on to further questions about cultivation of mind and the education of the masses. Further, the question presents itself, whether the general admiration of Shakespeare is genuine, whether it is not a mere fashion, whether the multitude of men understand him at all, whether it is not true that everyone makes much of him because everyone else makes much of him. Can we possibly make Shakespeare light reading, especially in this day of cheap novels, by ever so much correction of his text ?

It is clear enough from this that Newman himself did not believe in Shakespeare being a "popular" writer, no more than Bacon did, who often intimated that the works which were to keep alive with progressive vigour his all-embracing philosophy were such as would "select and, as it were, adopt fit and legitimate readers for themselves." They were not to be of the intoxicatingly pleasurable kind which the modern novel is typical of. *Verum gaudium, res severa*. Nevertheless, many of our great writers speak as if they did not agree with Newman on this point—as if any intelligent lover of fiction would take to Shakespeare as ducks to water, a delusion as baseless as the contrary experience is grounded on every-day facts.

I omit the next point of discussion, namely, the claim of the annotator to introduce into Shakespeare's text the emendation made upon his copy of 1632, and proceed to the author's treatment of the third point, namely, "the claim of Theobald's emendation to retain its place in the *textus receptus*."

"It strikes me with wonder that an argument in its defence could have been put forward to the following effect, viz., that, true though it be that the editors of

1623 are of much more authority than Theobald, and that the annotator's reading in the passage in question is more likely to be correct than Theobald's, nevertheless Theobald has by this time acquired a prescriptive right to its place there—the prescription of more than a hundred years—that usurpation has become legitimacy; that Theobald's words have sunk into the hearts of thousands; that, in fact, they have become Shakespeare's; that it would be a dangerous innovation and an evil precedent to touch them. If we begin an unsettlement of the popular mind, where is it to stop?

“Thus it appears, in order to do justice to the question before us, we have to betake ourselves to the consideration of myths, pious frauds, and other grave matters, which introduce us into a *sylva*, dense and intricate, of first principles and elementary phenomena belonging to the domains of archæology and theology. Nor is this all. When such views of the duty of garbling a classic are propounded, they open upon us a long vista of sceptical interrogations, which go far to disparage the claims upon us, the genius, the very existence of the great poet, to whose honour these views are intended to minister. For perhaps, after all, Shakespeare is really but a collection of many Theobalds, who have each of them a right to his own share of him. There was a great dramatic school in his day; he was one of a number of first-rate artists—perhaps they wrote in common. How are we to know what is his, or how much? Are the best parts his, or the worst? It is said that the players put in what is vulgar and offensive in his writings; perhaps they inserted the beauties. I have heard it urged years ago, as an objection to Sheridan's claim of authorship to the plays which bear his name, that they were so unlike each other. Is not this the very peculiarity of those imputed to Shakespeare? Were ever the writings of one man so various, so im-

personal? Can we form one true idea of what he was in history or character by means of them? Is he not, in short, *vox et præterea nihil*? Then again, in corroboration, is there any author's life so deficient in biographical notices as his? We know about Hooker, Spencer, Spelman, Walton, Harvey; what do we know of Shakespeare? Is he much more than a name? Is not the traditional object of an Englishman's idolatry after all a nebula of genius, destined, like Homer, to be resolved into its separate and independent luminaries as soon as we have a criticism powerful enough for the purpose? I must not be supposed for a moment to countenance such scepticism myself, though it is a subject worthy the attention of a sceptical age. Here I have introduced it simply to suggest how many words go to make up a thoroughly valid argument; how short and easy a way to a true conclusion is the logic of good sense; how little syllogisms have to do with the formation of opinion; how little depends upon the inferential proofs; how much upon those pre-existing beliefs and views in which men either agree with each other, or hopelessly differ, before they begin to dispute, and which are hidden deep in our nature, or, it may be, in our personal peculiarities."

We have here, I think, in these comments of Newman grounds for believing that his was a mind naturally Baconian in the modern sense of the word, and that, had it been possible for him to study the question in the light of what has been ascertained since he wrote "An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent," we should be able to add his great name to so many distinguished names of men who in this matter have not allowed themselves to be dominated by all or any of the "idols" which Bacon has warned us against.

WILLIAM A. SUTTON.

## MR. GEORGE GREENWOOD, M.P.

READERS of BACONIANA will hear with great regret of the cause of the delay in the publication of Mr. George Greenwood's reply to "The Baconian Heresy." In November last Mr. Greenwood had the misfortune to break his knee-cap. An operation was performed, which appeared to be successful. No sooner was Mr. Greenwood about again but a second fracture took place, which has necessitated a second operation. Mr. Greenwood is now lying in a Nursing Home and some time must elapse before he can resume his usual occupations. His reply to Mr. Robertson was nearly completed when the accident took place, but it has caused a delay in the publication which was anxiously looked forward to.

Mr. Greenwood has courteously placed at the service of the Editor of BACONIANA some pages of a chapter in his book which deal with Mr. Robertson's criticism of Max Müller's estimate of Shakespeare's vocabulary, which will prove of special interest to Baconians, as it justifies the position taken up by their colleague, the late Mr. G. C. Bompas.

---

It may here be appropriate to say a word on the Shakespearean vocabulary. Max Müller has frequently been quoted to the effect that Shakespeare used about 15,000 words in his plays. Now, upon this statement, Mr. Robertson treats us to the following note: "Max Müller, 'Lecture on the Science of Language,' 6th edition, I., 309, citing—of all authorities—Renan's 'Histoire des Langues Semitiques!' I cannot find the passage in my copy (2nd edition) of Renan. Mr. G. C. Bompas ('Problem of the Shakespeare Plays,' 1902, p. iv.) characteristically asserts that the 'estimate' is Max

Müller's own."\* According to Mr. Robertson, therefore, Max Müller did not himself form the estimate that Shakespeare used about 15,000 words in his plays, but merely took it from Renan's "Histoire des Langues Semitiques"—"of all authorities"!—and Mr. Bompas makes the "characteristically" false assertion that the estimate is Max Müller's own. As a fact, however, as I shall proceed to show, Mr. Bompas is quite right, and the "characteristic" assertion is Mr. Robertson's. Max Müller writes: "We are told on good authority by a country clergyman that some of the labourers in his parish had not three hundred words in their vocabulary. . . . A well-educated person in England who has been at a public school and at the university, who reads his Bible, his Shakespeare, the *Times*, and all the books of Mudie's library, seldom uses more than about 3,000 or 4,000 words in actual conversation. Accurate thinkers and close reasoners, who avoid vague and general expressions, and wait till they find the word that exactly fits their meaning, employ a larger stock, and eloquent speakers may rise to command of 10,000. The Hebrew Testament says all that it has to say with 5,642 words; Milton's works are built up with 8,000; and Shakespeare, who probably displayed a greater variety of expression than any writer in any language, produced all his plays with about 15,000 words."† Now here, it is true, we have the following curious note, "Renan, 'Histoire,' p. 138," and upon this Mr. Robertson would have us believe that Max Müller's estimate of the number of Shakespeare's words was not his own, but taken, without verification, from Renan. Then Mr.

\* Work cited, p. 517, note 3.

† "Science of Language," 1885, Vol. I., pp. 308-9. As to the labourer's vocabulary, given on the authority of a country clergyman, the reference is to "The Study of the English Language," by A. d'Orsey, p. 15.



Robertson turns to Renan's "Histoire des Langues Semitiques," at p. 138, and tells us he cannot find the passage in his copy. Of course he cannot, and if he had not been in such a hurry to score a point—a false point as it turns out—he would have very soon seen why. It might surely have struck him *à priori* that Max Müller would not be likely to take his estimate of Shakespeare's vocabulary from Renan. The fact is that the note, "Renan, 'Histoire,' p. 138," is obviously inserted in error on page 309 of the "Science of Language." "Histoire"—*what* "Histoire"? It might be the "Histoire d'Israel." But if the reader will turn back to page 307 of Max Müller's work he will find there the reference to the same page (138) of the "Histoire des Langues Semitiques" *in its proper place*, viz., as a note to the words "Hebrew has been reduced to about 500 roots." Let him then turn to Renan's works referred to, at p. 138, and he will find that Renan is here dealing with the Hebrew language. He will not find the authority for Max Müller's statement that this language has been reduced to about 500 roots on this particular page, but if he will read on to page 140 he will find "on evalue le nombre des racines hébraïques à cinq cents." He will see, further, that Max Müller's note, on p. 307, says Leusden counted 5,642 Hebrew and Chaldee words in the Old Testament, and this also he will find is taken from Renan's "Histoire des Langues Semitiques" (1863), at p. 140. It is quite plain, therefore, that the second reference to the "'Histoire,' p. 138," has crept in *per incuriam*, and that Max Müller, as might be expected, makes no reference at all to Renan in support of his statement with regard to the Shakespearean vocabulary. Thus it turns out, on examination, that Mr. Robertson's sneer at Max Müller and his supposed "authority," and his suggestion that Mr. Bompas is "characteristically" untrustworthy, are

based upon his own uncritical error, which a more careful examination of the works referred to would have enabled him to avoid. This is "characteristic" indeed!

Further, we have it on the authority of the late Mr. W. H. Edwards that "in the course of three lectures delivered at Oxford, and reprinted at Chicago, Professor Müller said, 'Few of us use more than 3,000 or 4,000 words; Shakespeare used about 15,000.'"<sup>\*</sup>

Other estimates have put the Shakespearean vocabulary even higher. Thus Craik estimated it at 21,000 words, without counting inflectional forms, while he estimated the vocabulary of Milton at but 7,000. Clark, who quotes these estimates in his "Elements of the English Language" (p. 134), says: "The vocabulary of Shakespeare becomes more than double that of any other writer in the English language. . . . English speech, as well as literature, owes more to him than any other man."

But this, of course, does not suit Mr. Robertson's argument. How could Farmer's *ignoramus* (and I have shown that I am quite justified in using that term concerning Shakspeare as portrayed by Farmer)—how could the half-educated man who had such very "small" Latin that he could not translate quite common words in that language, and who, having "less Greek," had none at all—how could *he* possess this huge vocabulary? Obviously the two theories are inconsistent. One of them must go by the board. So the "vocabulary" is thrown to the wolves, and we find Mr. Robertson suggesting (p. 521) "that the playwright was really not a man of supremely large vocabulary *for his time*"! What is the meaning of "*for his time*," I wonder! Is it suggested that Elizabethan vocabularies were normally

<sup>\*</sup> "Shaksper Not Shakespeare," by William H. Edwards (Cincinnati—The Robert Clarke Company, 1900), p. 195.

much larger than the vocabularies of the present day, and that though Shakespeare's vocabulary may be "supremely large" for the nineteenth century, it was not so for the seventeenth century? If this be not the meaning I really cannot see what the effect of the words I have italicised is intended to be. This, however, in passing only. It has been generally believed that Shakespeare's vocabulary is "supremely large" whether for his own time or ours, and until it is shown that Max Müller, and Clark, and Craik, and others are wrong, I think we may continue to believe that the fact is so. My own belief is that the explanation of the phenomenon (assuming its reality) is to be found in the further fact that it is the vocabulary not of one man but of several. Mr. Edwards writes: "This extraordinary vocabulary seems entirely too great for one individual, and hence it has been argued that this alone is enough to show that several hands took part in the Shakespeare plays." For myself, however, I should not cite the vocabulary as evidence of the "several hands," but knowing as we do that the work of "several hands" is to be found in "the Shakespeare plays," I should regard that fact as an explanation, in great part if not altogether, of the abounding Shakespearean vocabulary.

---

So far the chapter quoted. Mr. Greenwood adds, "Baconians, I fear you will not agree in the last part, but let that pass."

## REVIEW.

*Uncrowned.* A Story of Queen Elizabeth and the Early Life of Francis "Bacon," as told in his secret writings and in other contemporary records of her reign. By C. Y. C. Dawbarn, M.A. Drawings by I. Y. Dawbarn, M.A., LL.M. Longmans, Green & Co., London.

MR. DAWBARN will be remembered as the author of a valuable contribution to the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. A paper on the subject, which he read before the Liverpool Philomathic Society, was published in 1903. The arguments on both sides were clearly and impartially set forth, and if a perusal of it leads the reader to a belief in the Bacon authorship, it will be because the evidence points to that conclusion rather than as the result of special pleading.

"Uncrowned" Mr. Dawbarn describes as an historical romance. He states that the story of Bacon's life, as represented in Mrs. Gallup's cypher works, so haunted him that he could not put it aside, so he wrote it out, and concludes his preface thus: "And now I would that I had not, for it haunts me, and yet 'tis only a tale."

The narrative is cleverly put together. Statements, for which there exist historical evidence, are blended with extracts from the cypher story. Those Baconians who believe that Francis Bacon was the son of the Earl of Leicester and Queen Elizabeth will regard it with favour; those who adhere to the statements of history that he was the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon and Lady Anne, the daughter of Sir Anthony Cook, will regret its publication. There is little, if any, new matter in the book, and no fresh light is thrown on the life, the character, the work, or the aims of Francis. The book is excellently printed and bound.

---

 CORRESPONDENCE.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Francis Bacon was at considerable trouble to assure us, by inductive methods of reasoning, that he was author of the Shakespeare plays. I think I can claim to be first discoverer of the following two instances. This may stimulate your readers to look for others.

According to the K. cypher, one hundred and eleven is the numerical equivalent of the name Bacon. Page III of the Shakespeare Folio occurs in that part of "Much Ado about Nothing" where Dogbery and Verges enter.

Dogbery asks, "Who think you the most disartless man to be constable (Be/Con's/table)?" The reply is, "Hugh Otecake,

sir, or George Seacole." The capital letters of these names spell "Hogs." Ergo for Bacon's table = hogs.

Dogbery proceeds to tell Seacole to hear the Lanthorn. Now a seacool lanthorn is a Beacon. In Elizabethan times Beacon and Bacon were pronounced alike. At the end of the Act Dogbery says, "Go good partner, go, get you to *Francis Seacole* [the italics are mine]. Bid him bring his pen and inkhorn to the goal."

"Seacole" having become "Bacon" "George" gets to be "Francis."

A second instance is in *King Henry IV.*, 1st part.

In this Owen Glendower is made to say :

"at my nativity  
The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes,  
Of burning cressets ; and at my birth  
The frame and foundation of the earth  
Shak'd like a coward."

This does not agree with Holinshed, upon whose history the play was founded.

Holinshed only refers to a coincident accident to the horses of Owen Glendower's father. At the nativity (which is the time, manner, and circumstance of the birth) of Glendower *of the play*, the front of heaven was full of burning cressets = beacons. Specimens of the beacons of the period are on the title page of Gustavo Sileno, 1624 (see the facsimile in Sir E. Durning-Lawrence's book, "Bacon Is Shakespeare").

Owen Glendower of the play was therefore born under Baconian (beaconion) auspices. A sphere ("the frame and foundation of the earth") shook at his birth, *ergo* :

Shak—speare bore him.

Another Owen seems bent on making history in South Wales.

After two failures, one wonders whether a third will follow. If his guides are no better than those used on the occasions of the first and second searches, a prediction in *Henry IV.*, first part, is likely to be realised in Dr. Owen's instance :

"Thrice from the banks of Wye  
And sandy-bottomed Severn have I sent him  
Booteless home, and weather beaten back."

PARKER WOODWARD.

## Literary Legends.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Since my little article under the above heading appeared in BACONIANA, I have come upon an extract from a work, written with no special reference to the Bacon-Shakespeare con-

troversy, so confirmatory of the views I have endeavoured to support as to the concealment of authorship in Tudor times, that I have affixed it to the reprint of the article now in pamphlet form, and will ask you, if you can spare the space, to allow it to appear here. It is this :—

“That” (the Tudor period), says the writer, “was not only a time of severe repression and harsh government, but also a time when free speech was impossible. Able men could only dissemble and speak in allegory. The Plays of Shakespeare and other writers are, doubtless, a reflection of the period; the names but a disguise—the Playwriters merely the spokesmen of those who would have been sent to the Tower and Block, if they had expressed their opinions openly.”

The extract is from a work entitled “The Rise of English Culture” by Edwin Johnson, M.A. (London)—a work which, though published in 1904, and from the pen of one of the ablest classicists of the day (*teste* his distinguished tutor Dr. W. Smith, of Dictionary fame), and one who, it would seem, like Bacon, had taken “all knowledge to be his province”—a work too, which had been pronounced by a few capable critics (chiefly abroad) as “one of the most important works of the century”—seems as yet almost unknown to readers in this country. For this reason I would heartily commend its perusal (if they can procure a copy) to my brother Baconians, whose theory it powerfully, though incidentally and unintentionally—and the more so for that reason—supports.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

### King Henry IV.—First part.

TO THE EDITOR OF “BACONIANA.”

HOLINSHED referring to Owen Glendower wrote :—

“Strange wonders happened at the nativity of this man; for the same night he was born, all his father’s horses were found to stand in blood up to their bellies.”

This was a “*tall*” statement. The author of the play amused himself by going one better. Glendower, “I cannot blame him, at my nativity, the front of heaven was full of fiery shapes, of burning cressets, and at my birth, the frame and the foundation of the earth shook like a coward.”

When therefore the Glendower of the play (not of history) was born his nativity was under the light of beacons (Bacon) and the sphere, viz, the frame and the foundations shook. —“Shake sphere bore him tremblingly.” Q.E.D.

[Several articles and a number of letters are held over until the next number appears for lack of space.]



# The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

---

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be :—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet ; also his character, genius, and life ; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakspeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea ; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

---

*The columns of BACONIANA are open for the expression of all shades of opinion on the subjects discussed therein, although such opinions may not be in accord with those held by the Council of the Society or the Editor of the Journal.*



# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1914. No. 46

---

## THE FIRST FOLIO.

THE most carefully prepared and the most perfectly printed book ever produced by man is the First Folio of the Shakespeare plays published in 1623, and perhaps the thing most discreditable to the literary world is the mighty mass of manifest blunders, miscalled corrections, that is found in the "Variorum" and other editions of the plays.

In the address "To the Great Variety of Readers," which forms the preface, we are told that the plays "are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them. Who, as he was a happie imitator of Nature, was a most gentle expressor of it. His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he uttered with that easinesse, that wee have scarce received from him a blot in his papers."

These words tell us the true story of the manner in which the "Great Master," Bacon, arranged every column, and every word in every column, and every capital letter in every column, and every italic letter and word in every column, and every "printer's error" in every column, and every misprint in every column, to be exactly as and where we find them. He also arranged

in the most purposeful manner every mispagination throughout the volume.

Accordingly, the Folio is signed "hang'd hog" upon the first page by means of a "printer's error," and signed upon the last page by means of a mispagination. The last page is numbered 993 instead of 399, and 993 spells "Baconus."

In very numerous books of the period upon page 53 we find some reference to Bacon or Shakespeare. The First Folio, although bound in one volume, consists of three books—"The Comedies," "The Histories," and "The Tragedies"—each of which is separately paged. Upon the first page 53, that is in "The Comedies," we find an ignorant boy, William, who incorrectly gives "hinc" as the accusative case of "hic"; and a Welsh schoolmaster, Evans, is introduced for the purpose of pronouncing "c" as "g." This man does not correct the boy's blunder, because if he so did he would spoil the key-words; but he says, "I pray you remember (childe) accusativo hing hang hog." Then Mrs. Quickly cries out, "Hang-hog is latten for Bacon I warrant you."

To fully understand this revelation of Bacon's authorship on the first page 53 we must refer to Bacon's "Apophthegms," which were not published until 1671, and are numbered from 1 to 307. Now, to which of these must we look for the explanation?

There are thirty-six plays in the Folio, and this number is not accidental, but thirty-six is a cabalistic number. Bacon brought out his thirty-six plays in English in London in 1623 under the name of William Shakespeare, and he brought out in the same year (1623) thirty-six of his plays in French in Paris under the name of Alexandre Hardy. In the edition of his Essays in Italian, published in 1618, the thirty-sixth is "Delle Fattioni"; that is concerning stage plays; and

in his "De Augmentis," first published in English in 1641, the 36th of the Antitheta begins with the words "The stage." Therefore, in order to learn the meaning of "Hang-hog" on page 53 in the plays we must look to the 36th of Bacon's Apophthegms, and there we read :

"Sir *Nicholas Bacon*, being appointed a Judge for the Northern Circuit, and having brought his Trials that came before him to such a pass, as the passing of Sentence on Malefactors, he was by one of the Malefactors mightily importuned for to save his life, which when nothing that he had said did avail, he at length desired his mercy on account of kindred: Prethee, said my Lord Judge, how came that in? Why, if it please you my Lord, your name is *Bacon*, and mine is *Hog*, and in all Ages *Hog* and *Bacon* have been so near kindred, that they are not to be separated. I [Aye] but replied Judge *Bacon*, *you and I cannot be kindred, except you be hanged; for Hog is not Bacon until it be well hanged.*"

This gruesome story explains Dame Quickly's words upon the first page 53 of the Plays. Upon the next page 53, which is in the Histories, we read: "be hangd: come away." And the second carrier replies: "I have a Gammon of Bacon." This is only found on page 53 by means of mispagination, for pages 47 and 48 are purposely omitted.

Those acquainted with cyphers and emblems, especially with 'Masonic emblems, will not expect to find the third revelation upon the visible page 53 but upon the invisible page 53. Now, in any book the invisible page 53 is page 53 counting not from the beginning but from the end of the volume. The page that is 53 from the end in the Folio is page 347, and on this page 53 from the end we find as the 53rd word from the commencement of the new scene "Wilde-Boares." A "wild-

boar " is Bacon's crest. Mr. George Hookham wrote to me that this discovery gave him quite a shock, because since " Wilde-Boares " is found only this one time in the Folio in which there are about two million words, the chance against " Wilde-Boares " being found on the 53rd page from the end as the 53rd word from the commencement of a new scene is two millions against unity. In other words, it is absolutely certain that the Great Master " Bacon " must have purposefully arranged the pages and the columns and the words in the columns of the first Folio, so that we find his crest, a " Wilde-Boare," as the 53rd word from the commencement of a new scene on page 347, which is the 53rd page from the end of the volume.

An excellent example of the extremely careful manner in which the first Folio is printed will be found upon the first page 136. This page commences with the same words and is practically taken bodily, with a few important corrections, from F. 4 (the little book is not paged) in the Quarto of *Loves Labour's lost*, which was published in 1598, and is the first play to which the name of William Shakespeare was attached. The whole page is a cypher revelation of Bacon's authorship. We must remember that the key number of the Shakespeare plays is No. 287. The plays commence with the lines " To the Reader," which tell us, in the clearest manner, that the so-called portrait of William Shakespeare is merely a dummy. If the letters of this skit are counted, the four V's, which are inserted instead of two W's, being counted, as they are intended to be, as four letters, we shall find that the total number of the letters is 287, which is a well-known 'Masonic number. It is not by accident but by extraordinary skill and care that the revelation found in F. 4 of the 1598 Quarto of *Love's Labours lost* has been placed on the first page 136 of the Folio. If we deduct 136 from 287 we get 151, and

we find—omitting words in italics—that Honorificabilitudinitatibus (the numerical value of the letters of which amount to 287) is the 151st word from the top of the page.

If anyone will read Chapter X. in my book, "Bacon Is Shakespeare," they will find that this long word placed where it appears in the Folio proves with absolute certainty that the plays are Bacon's children. But my present object is to show the extreme care exercised in preparing the first Folio. In the 1598 Quarto of *L.L.L.*, in consequence of a printer's error, the count is 150. This has been corrected in the Folio, so as to give the exact figure required, viz., 151. The lines have also been most carefully re-arranged, so that "What is A b speld backward with a horn on his head" appears as it should appear on line 33, because 33 spells Bacon

{ B A C O N  
  2 1 3 14 13 = 33 } as we find in a number of

books and emblems.

In 1623 Bacon brought out his plays in London under Shakespeare's name, and in the following year, 1624, he brought out at Lunæburg, under the name of Gustavus Selenus (the man-in-the-moon), his great Cryptographic book which forms a key to many of the cyphers contained in the plays. Upon the title-page of this work, printed 1624, appears the only portrait of the real man William Shakespeare of Stratford, excepting that shown in Dugdale's engraving of the Stratford bust, which was not printed till 1656. I have placed upon the screen the 1624 face of the Spearman side by side with Dugdale's engraving of the bust (1656), both enlarged a hundred-fold, and no one can doubt that they represent the same person. Thus all the nonsense that has been written about the supposed incorrectness of Dugdale's representation is disposed of.

Now to return to page 136 of the first Folio of the plays. Commencing at line 33 we read :—

What is A b, speld backward with a horn on his head ?

*Peda.*—Ba *puericia* with a horne added.

*Pag.*— Ba most seely Sheepe, with a horne : you heare his learning.

*Peda.*—*Quis, quis*, thou consonant ?

*Pag.*— The last of the five Vowels if You repeat them, or the fift if I.

*Peda.*—I will repeat them : a e I [Mark that the I is a capital letter ; this is all important for the cypher].

*Pag.*— The Sheepe, the other two concludes it, o u.

The right answer as to what is A b speld backward with a horn on his head is, of course, B a, with the Latin word "cornu" added, "Bacorn you fool." Then we have the query "Quis, quis?" Which Bacon? The answer to which is a e I o u, which spells F R A. We are thus told Fra Bacon. In order to know that a e I o u spells F R A we must turn to Bacon's 1624 great Cryptographic book. To what page should we look? As I have shown, the key number of page 136 in the Folio of the plays is number 287. Our present story commences on line 33, so we must deduct that number from 287 and we get 254; and if we turn to page 254 in Bacon's great Cryptographic book of 1624 we shall find that we can make all the letters of the alphabet by taking the vowels in pairs. Acting on the rules and the table there supplied we find that "a" followed by "e" makes the letter "F." Then "I" being a capital letter does not follow "e" but starts afresh, and "I" followed by "o" makes the letter "R"; while "o" followed by "u" makes the letter "A," and completes the F R A, which gives us Fra Bacon.

The hopelessly ignorant literati who so foolishly alter what they fail to understand in the first Folio have run riot over the wonderful page 136 in the Folio, which is

absolutely perfect in every line and in every letter. Indeed, I think nothing can surpass the crass stupidity of the senseless alteration of the clever stage joke, "the last of the five vowels if you repeat them, the fifth if I," which induces the gull to try and repeat the vowels, when he is pounced upon by the boy so soon as he has said "I." This joke they have destroyed by converting it into the plain prose statement, "The third of the five vowels, if you repeat them, the fifth if I," which is not only not a catch, but is so manifestly a snare that the veriest nincompoop would never have attempted to repeat the vowels, but would have said to the boy, "You malapert rascal; you mean me." Of course, the ignoramuses "correct" a e I. (which gives the cypher) into a e i. (which does not). They seem never capable of understanding that every capital letter and every seeming error in the first Folio has a meaning and that it is sacrilege to change a sign or a syllable. Every instance given in the January (1914) number of *BACONIANA* supplies an example of the marvellous correctness of the printing of the 1623 first Folio of the plays, and of the hopeless imbecility of the would-be correctors, who are altogether ignorant of the inner meaning of the plays.

EDWIN DURNING-LAWRENCE.

## THE FIRST FOLIO.

**I**T is impossible in the restricted pages of BACONIANA to attempt to cover the whole of the ground opened by Mr. G. B. Rosher's article on the alleged errors contained in the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays. The editors and commentators in the long array of quotations cited, by their unanimity appear to demonstrate beyond question that the work as issued from the press was set up from copy which was put together in a rough, crude and careless manner, and that its defects were intensified by what can only be described as culpable negligence on the part of the printers. The opinions quoted are said to be those "of men whose names collectively stand for a great deal in the way of Shakespearean study, knowledge and authority." It would ill become one, who has no authority to speak upon the subject, to criticise the work of the eminent men whose conclusions are given, and these observations are offered with all diffidence. But they are founded on a close acquaintance with the writings of most of the men quoted, a general knowledge of those of the remainder and of the whole field of literature which comes under the classification of "Shakespeareana."

The poems and plays of Shakespeare have never yet been edited by any man possessing the intelligence, the knowledge and other qualifications necessary for such a task. Admirable work has been done. Points have been raised and suggestions made which are of great value. It might almost be said that the blunders of these eminent men are instructive to the student. How curious it is to notice that the criticisms on Shakespeare's geographical allusions are ill-founded, and the result of ignorance on the part of those who made them! Shakespeare was right and his critics were



wrong, as Sir Edward Sullivan has conclusively proved.\* Dr. Samuel Johnson in his preface has justified the propriety of the use of anachronisms, and attributes them to design and not to ignorance. "Every page is so scandalously false spelled," wrote Pope. But there was no standard for spelling in the Elizabethan period. Every writer varied spelling at his pleasure and would frequently spell the same word in two or three different ways on the same page. The controversies which have raged around the interpretation of various passages, many of which deal with trivialities that are of no consequence, have been laboured to boredom; still all have tended to a better understanding of the poet's meaning.

The editors, commentators and critics have, however, approached the great masterpieces of literature from a wrong standpoint. They have, with few exceptions, assumed that they were the production of a man of genius who was ill-educated. There has been too much desire to "put Shakespeare right," and in attempting this there has appeared an obvious feeling on the part of the writers that they were criticising the work of one who was their inferior in culture and knowledge. These men have approached the subject much in the same way as a distinguished Royal Academician would regard the pictures of some young untrained artist of genius. True, there are exceptions. Lessing, Schlegel, and Gervinus all recognised the true position of the poet, as did S. T. Coleridge and others. Dr. C. M. Ingleby wrote in 1874, "We are at length slowly rounding to a just estimate of his works; and the time seems to be at hand when men of culture will attribute to the object of their admiration a much higher range of powers than

\* See *Nineteenth Century* for August, 1908. Article on "Shakespeare and the Waterways of North Italy," by Sir Edward Sullivan, Bart.

were requisite for the production of the most popular and successful dramas in the world."

No man is capable of adequately editing an edition of Shakespeare's poems and plays who has not a thorough knowledge of the books published in England and France between the years 1576 and 1630. If one may judge from the works published upon literature, no man has yet written who had this knowledge, or even had a knowledge of the books published in England. John Payne Collier's writings bear evidence that scores of important works of that period had not come under his observation. The ignorance of men of letters about the Elizabethan and early Jacobean literature is appalling. The bulk of the books published during the period in question are known only to some book collectors and some second-hand booksellers. How few of these have read the books, and how fewer still recognise their bearing upon what is termed the great English Renaissance in literature which had its culmination in the publication of the First Folio in 1623! The French literature of that period is, though of less, still of great importance, and a knowledge of it is essential to the ideal editor. The remarkable fact is that most, if not all, of these French works were translated into English and published in England at a time when there were so few to read or appreciate them that a heavy loss must have been entailed on someone by the production of each volume. The books of this period were well printed, and for the most part free from glaring errors. Richard Field, George Bishop, Adam Islip, George Eld, John Havaland, William Jaggard, and others produced volumes which were a credit to any printer. In 1623, the year in which the First Folio appeared, William Jaggard published "The Theatre of Honour and Knighthood, or a Compendious Chronicle and Historie of the whole Christian World, written by Andrew

Favine, Parisian." The name of the translator into English is not mentioned. The remarkable dedication to Sir Henrie Montague Knight, Lord Baron of Kimbalton, Viscount Mandeville, bears at its foot the initials W. I., presumably William Jaggard the printer. The book contains upwards of 1,100 pages—and is an example of excellency in the printer's art. It is profusely illustrated with woodcuts.

Jaggard deservedly had a great reputation as a printer. How is it possible that he should permit a book to be published bearing his name, and containing, if Professor G. L. Craik be right, upwards of 20,000 errors? The great printers have always taken a pride in the manner in which their work was turned out. It is related of John Froben, one of the greatest printers of all time, who employed on his staff of editors Erasmus, that when the proof-sheets were ready to go to press, he posted them up outside his office, and offered a prize to anyone who could detect an error in the letterpress. In 1623, John Haviland printed John Minsheu's Dictionary in Spanish and English, together with a Spanish Grammar, and a book of Pleasant and Delightful Dialogues in Spanish and English, containing in all 543 pages—another great example of the printer's art. This list might be extended to comprise scores of books. The printers were proud of their calling and emulated each other in the excellence of their works. What could Jaggard have been doing to permit the First Folio to be issued in the condition in which it has come down to us, unless it was intentionally so printed?

If the editors and commentators are right, the First Folio stands out as a literary curiosity—the worst printed book which was ever issued from the press. Here is a work acknowledged to be the very acme of all the literature of the world, the authorised version of

the Scriptures only excepted—a work which has caused the production of a literature bearing on it, not only in England, but in other countries, which is without a parallel—printed and published so that it has become a bye-word for all time. But that is not the only cause for amazement. The prevailing opinion is that it was published under the supervision of Ben Jonson, who was certainly a scholar, if not a pedant. He must have known the condition in which it was going through the press. What was he thinking about to permit his name to appear on such an outrage on all scholarship? The Grocer Heminge, and his friend might permit their names to be appended to the address to the Reader. They had no literary reputation which could suffer. But Ben Jonson? Impossible.

What, then, is the explanation? Are the critics once more in error, and was "William Shakespeare" by design publishing what he knew to be the greatest work of all time in cryptic form so that the wits of future ages might recognise his mind, although in a weed? Was it all part of the great delusion?

An attempt will now be made to deal only with two classes of the alleged 20,000 errors. How many of the total Professor Craik would apportion to these two classes it is difficult to determine, but if the punctuation and mispagination of the volume can be vindicated, a very substantial reduction in that total must be made.

In 1911 the Clarendon Press of Oxford published a little work entitled "Shakespearian Punctuation." It is a book which should be upon the shelves of every student of Shakespeare. It is one of the ablest works which have appeared on the Shakespeare productions. The author is Mr. Percy Simpson, M.A., formerly scholar of Selwyn College, Cambridge. Mr. Simpson is now collaborating with Professor Herford in an edition of Ben Jonson's works in nine volumes which will

undoubtedly become the standard edition. By permission the introduction to "Shakespearian Punctuation" is now reproduced. No further comments are here necessary, as it covers the ground so effectually that at any rate the alleged errors in punctuation in the First Folio must tentatively be withdrawn as open to argument.

This is Mr. Percy Simpson's "Introduction":—

"It is a common practice at the present day to treat the punctuation of seventeenth-century books as beneath serious notice; editors rarely allude to it, and if they do, they describe it as chaotic and warn the reader that they have been driven to abandon it. It seems to be imagined that the compositor peppered the pages promiscuously with any punctuation-marks that came to hand, and was lavish of commas because his stock of these was large. In other words, old printers—printers as a class—were grossly illiterate and careless; the utmost that could be expected of them was that they should spell out their texts correctly; nobody troubled about punctuation, not even the 'Corrector,' who is referred to occasionally, for praise or the reverse, by writers of the time."

"Doubtless an adroit compiler could get together an assortment of quartos so badly printed as almost to justify a theory so wild as this. But very little reflection should convince a reader of average intelligence that the idea is ludicrous. Has any scholar of standing ever made the attempt to substantiate such a charge by evidence? Is it on *a priori* grounds likely that printers were more ignorant than the majority of their fellow-men? Could a human being endowed with reason serve an apprenticeship, work at the trade of printing all his life, and set up the type of book after book, without fathoming the inscrutable mystery of the comma and the full stop? To come to close quarters with this

curious problem: we may concede that a careless or ignorant printer might leave out stops since the omission perhaps saved him trouble; but would he insert them gratuitously for the fun of the thing? Would he print the beautiful lines of Donne in this form—

For love, all love of other fights controules,  
And makes one little roome, an every where.—

as a sheer freak in typography? or is it possible to attach a significance to the commas? Is not the beauty of the rhythm heightened and the phrasing touched with deeper meaning if the voice rests for a moment after the words with the unusual pointing?"

"The fact is that English punctuation has radically changed in the last three hundred years. Modern punctuation is, or at any rate attempts to be, logical; the earlier system was mainly rhythmical. Apply this test to a few pages of the First Folio or the 1609 edition of the *Sonnets*, and it gives a clue to many of the apparent anomalies. Indeed, a lover of poetry, who prefers to read Shakespeare as he was printed and wishes for plain, practical directions in this matter of punctuation, cannot do better than take a work of moderate compass like the *Sonnets*, accessible in facsimile, and collate it with a standard edition of the present day till he has mastered the main points of difference. He will find even in these details a subject of poetic study, for the printer of the 1609 text was at great pains to indicate the rhythm by the punctuation. The *Sonnets* are frequently referred to in the following pages, but one passage of exceptional beauty must be cited as evidence here.

If it be not, then loue doth well denote,  
Loues eye is not fo true as all mens: no,  
How can it? O how can loues eye be true,  
That is fo vext with watching and with teares?

*Sonnet cxlvi. 7—10.*

Instead of adding any comment of my own, I prefer to summon an independent witness. Mr. George Wyndham has pointed out that in these lines 'there is revealed a piece of punctuation so exquisite as to affirm an author's hand.' He adds, with reference to the colon and pause in the eighth line, 'No journeyman-printer, no pirate-publisher, achieved that effect. It leads up, with the prescience of consummate art, to the rhythmical stress on the second "can" in line 9, and, in its own way, it is as subtle.' " " \*

"There is a second important difference between the old and the new systems. Modern punctuation is uniform; the old punctuation was quite the reverse. It was natural that in the earlier stages of printing usage should be less settled, and it was certainly convenient for the printer. For the poet it was something more: a flexible system of punctuation enabled him to express subtle differences of tone. A comparison of the two following passages is suggestive.

Shee is a woman, therefore may be woo'd,  
 Shee is a woman, therefore may be wonne,  
 She is *Lauinia* therefore must be lou'd.

*Titus Andronicus*, II, i. 82—4.

*Suf.* She's beautifull; and therefore to be Wooed;  
 She is a Woman; therefore to be Wonne.

*Henry the Sixth*, Part I. v. iii. 78—9.

The justification for either pointing is given below (pp. 18, 19 and § § 26, 30); but there is here more than a superficial change. The poet's instinct—for this too was no haphazard variation of the printer—has used even these trivial details to indicate a spiritual difference. Suffolk, who has just captured Margaret of Anjou, falls passionately in love with her at once; he speaks in troubled asides, and he follows this very reflection with the thought that he has a wife already, and that

\* The "Poems of Shakespeare," p. 266.

Margaret is too great to be his paramour. In the end he woos and wins her for the King. The checked and broken speech indicates the conflict in his mind. But in the other passage Demetrius, fired with lust and revenge, has schemed effectively to seize Lavinia, and the confident, unpausing note is in keeping with his character and situation."

"It would be easy to multiply instances of variety which admit of intelligible explanation, but with the principle once stated, it will be sufficient to take one or two typical cases. When Moonshine tries to make his first speech in the interlude of *Pyramus and Thisbe*, the words might run simply and directly as they would generally be pronounced,

My selfe the man i'th Moone doth seeme to be.

Or according to the common practice of marking off a phrase or group of words with an enclosing comma (§ 10), the words might be punctuated,

My selfe the man i'th Moone, doth seeme to be.

But the Folio actually prints

My selfe, the man i'th Moone doth feeme to be,

indicating the speaker's self-importance by an emphatic pause (§ 7)."

"An extreme case of variety occurs in punctuating an interrupted speech; the break may be marked by a comma (§ 9), or a semicolon (§ 28), or a colon (§ 32), or the modern dash, or a full stop (§ 36), or no stop at all (§ 41). We call our modern punctuation logical, but we can produce nothing to equal the uncompromising logic of a system which dispensed with stops when, from the nature of the sentence, the stops could not perform their function. The absence of stops is sometimes very suggestive. Pistoll's speech after he has taken his first timid bite of the leek (*Henry the Fifth*, v. i. 49—50), is thus printed in the Folio :



By this Lecke, I will moft horribly reuenge I eate and eate I fwearc.

It is a pity to clog this disordered utterance with the puny restraint of commas. The words come wildly from the victim while he writhes and eats and roars, and Fluellen's cudgel supplies a very satisfactory punctuation for them."

"In such passages the modernizers sacrifice something of the life and force of the original, and for this the smoothness of a uniform system is scant compensation. But the text of Shakespeare is disfigured by actual blunders for which the principle of modernizing is not responsible. The opening line of *Sonnet lxxxiv.*, as Shakespeare wrote it and Eld printed it, is—

Who is it that sayes moft, which can say more,  
Then this rich praise, that you alone, are you, . . .

Here 'which' is a relative pronoun, but it has been frequently read as interrogative, and the line distorted to

Who is it that fays most? which can fay more . . . ?"

"An equally bad instance occurs in *Macbeth* i ii. 55—7, where the Folio reads—

Till that *Bellona's* Bridegroom, lapt in proffe,  
Confronted him with felfe-comparifons,  
Point againft point, rebellious Arme 'gainft Arme, . . .

Most editors since Theobald have imagined that they improved the rhythm of this passage by printing

Point againft point rebellious, arm 'gainft arm.

By thus deserting the Folio, they have obliterated a characteristic feature of Shakespeare's style: when he points a double antithesis in this way, he avoids monotony and attains emphasis by putting an adjective with the second pair. For instance,

Turne face to face, and bloody point to point.

*King Iohn*, ii. i. 390.

Then call them to our prence face to face,  
And frowning brow to brow, . . .

*Richard the Second*, i. i. 15—16.

That Face to Face, and Royall Eye to Eye,  
You haue congrected : . . .

*Henry the Fifth*, v. ii. 30—1.

Teare for teare, and louing kiffe for kiffe, . . .

*Titus Andronicus*, v. iii. 156.

The evidence here is overwhelming, but it is perfectly clear why editors have gone astray. They have been accustomed to treat the Folio as utterly devoid of value in anything that depends upon the printing. Instead of adopting a critical attitude and asking, 'Can this be kept? has it any meaning? are there parallels?' they merely follow the promptings of their fancy and in nine passages out of ten trifle with the text."

"In point of fact, then, the attempt here made to expound and classify the earlier methods of punctuation involves a larger and very important issue. If the current view is right that the First Folio was set up by careless printers, the gravest suspicion is cast upon the text itself. At a time when conjecture ran riot in it, no one could have had an inkling of the real nature of the problem. But that day is over, and the scope of textual criticism can now be accurately defined; the poet's words are no longer, we may hope, in danger of reckless alteration. Yet three minor points remain in which—to judge from recent evidence—the Folio is still liable to attack. These are spelling, the arrangement of the verse, and punctuation. Spelling may safely be left to look after itself, especially in view of the fact that phonetic spellings have been pilloried as misprints. The verse-arrangement is more likely to have confused a printer, especially in dialogue. Apart from a practice of the Folio to break up a blank verse line and print it, where possible, as two half lines—a practice which was

certainly intentional at times \*—there remain a number of passages in which the lines are incorrectly distributed. But the punctuation, which is usually regarded as the weakest point in the printing of the Folio, I believe to be on the whole sound and reasonable. It will help to a higher appreciation of the merits of this famous text if its claim to be regarded as correct in an elementary point of typography can be conclusively established. I have attempted to marshal the evidence, and I venture to submit the issue to the judgment of scholars. Was there, or was there not, a system of punctuation which old printers used? Can the differences of this system be classified, and proved step by step by an accumulation of instances? If so, we must do Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount and their workmen the justice to believe that they knew how to print."

Here ends the "Introduction" to Shakesperian Punctuation.

---

To explain in an article the reasons for stating that the mispagnations in the First Folio were intentional is difficult. It is true that mispagnations in the books of that period are not uncommon. As a rule, however, these are slight, and consist of an incorrect figure in the number of a page, the pages before and after being correctly paged. But in some books the numbers are so erratic and on such a large scale that it is impossible to conceive that they could pass unobserved by the printer or his reader. Clark and Glover are quoted by Mr. Rosher as stating in the preface of Vol. I. of the "Cambridge Shakespeare" that in those days it does not appear that there were any proof-sheets sent either to author or editor. They consider it certain that after a manuscript had been sent to press it was seen only by the

\* See pp. 69, 70.

printers and one or more correctors of the press regularly employed by the publishers for that purpose. This is only their opinion, and the grounds are not stated upon which it is formed. There is no evidence which the writer can find to justify this statement, but there is evidence as to the condition in which manuscripts were sent to the printer. Corrections by the printer when the copy was in type were more difficult than they are to-day, and the manuscript was fair copied and revised before it came into the hands of the printers.

A notable example of this is a manuscript preserved in the British Museum of the translation attributed to Sir John Harrington of Ariosto's "Orlando Furioso," printed by Richard Field in 1591. The manuscript has been beautifully copied on 4to. paper and is marked off throughout, showing the stanzas which are to be printed on each page. The number of the page is given and the printer's signature for the foot of the page.\* At the end of the manuscript are certain directions to the printer as to type, &c. It appears clear that this is not the copy from which the printer set up his type. It is perfectly clean and unsoiled, and it is impossible to believe that the compositor could have used it and left it in such a condition. The probability is that this manuscript was again copied out, page by page, on separate sheets, and that these were handed to the compositor to use in setting up the type. The careful manner in which the manuscript was prepared for the printer is made evident from this example.

There is in existence the final revised manuscript of John Barclay's "Argenis," published in Paris in 1621.

\* All these instructions are undoubtedly in Francis Bacon's handwriting. There can be no doubt about this in the mind of anyone who is conversant with the peculiarities of his figures.

It is written in Latin in the author's handwriting. Every page abounds in corrections and alterations, prose in some cases crossed out and the text rendered into poetry substituted. In some places sheets of an earlier copy are incorporated. This is obvious from the pagination, which has not been altered, and the handwriting, which is different. That the corrections and alterations are the work of the author is self-evident. As corrected, it agrees in every word with the text of the volume published in 1621. The printer would have found it a difficult, if not impossible, task to set up the type from this copy. The clean and unsoiled condition makes it plain that this was not the manuscript which was used in the compositor's room. It would be re-copied probably after the style of the "Orlando Furioso" manuscript and no doubt marked in the same manner.

It is noteworthy that in an emblem book published in 1616, two of the illustrations depict the inside of a printer's workshop. In both of these a man wearing a hat of the well-known Bacon shape is standing beside the compositor, apparently giving him directions as to the setting of the type.

Probably the two volumes in the whole of literature containing the greatest eccentricities in pagination are "The Two\* books of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and advancement of Learning, divine and humane," and the First Folio. The former was published by Henrie Tomes in 1605. In this each leaf, not page, is numbered. With the exception of the trifle which was published in 1597, containing ten short essays and the "Meditationes Sacræ," this was Bacon's first work. At the time of its publication he was 45

\* The word two on the title-page is spelt TVVOO. So far, the writer has been unable to find the word so spelt in any other book.

years of age and not by any means actively employed. It was addressed to the King, but was probably written many years before its publication, for many of the deficiencies pointed out in it had already been supplied. It would not be surprising to find that the book was written as early as 1580 and had formed the basis of that long suit to Elizabeth which was never granted. This, however, is by-the-way. Be this as it may, it might be expected that in the first book of any pretensions which Bacon published he would have been careful that it should issue from the press in a perfect condition. What are the facts as to its pagination? The 45 leaves of the first book are correctly numbered. In the second book there is no number on leaf 6. Leaf 9 is numbered 6, the correct figure apparently printed upside down; 30 is numbered 33; from 31 to 70 the pagination is correct, and then the leaves are numbered thus: 70, 70, 71, 70, 72, 74, 73, 74, 75, 69, 77, 78, 79, 80, 77, 74, 69, 69, 82, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 97, 99, 94, 100, 99, 102, 103, 103, 93, 106, and then on correctly until the last page, except that 115 is numbered 105.

Is it possible that this extraordinary pagination could have escaped the observation of printer, printer's reader, or author? There can only be one answer to this question. There must have been some design in this pagination which has not been revealed.

Upon turning to the First Folio, almost a similar state of apparent negligence is found. But here the object of the mispagination has been unravelled by Mr. E. V. Tanner, who can account for practically every apparent error. It is always unsatisfactory to make assertions without offering evidence in support of them, but to offer such evidence on the point in question in the present article would be impossible. Suffice it to say that every mispagination in the First Folio is intentional and forms part of a design to leave to pos-

terity the data by an application of which to his inductive method Bacon's connection with the publication can be revealed. The writer once more challenges Shakespearean scholars to investigate the evidence which can be advanced in support of this statement.

There the matter must remain for the present. If it is remarkable that this great heritage of the human race should have been sent down to posterity in a volume under circumstances which have led men to say that in it "the corruptions are more numerous and of a grosser kind than can well be conceived but by those who have looked nearly into them"—if it be remarkable that William Jaggard, the printer of repute and excellent work, and Ben Jonson, the scholar and critic, should have permitted their names to be associated with a book so full of errors as to be a literary curiosity—surely any attempt to afford a reasonable explanation should be welcomed by the literary world. If it be proved that the alleged errors in punctuation and pagination are not errors of carelessness or negligence, but are in accordance with the author's design, surely a position has been established which justifies a demand that judgment should be suspended as to the remaining alleged errors until they have been tabulated and, if possible, a reasonable explanation of each one advanced. If the proof be established in two classes of the alleged errors, explanations, which may appear at first sight harder of belief, of other classes must be accepted. If it be proved that the editor, whoever he was, intentionally introduced what appear to be errors as part of a design, having regard to all the circumstances, the onus of proof lies on the attacking party to demonstrate that the explanations of the remaining apparent errors are not accounted for by explanations which can be given.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

## SOMETHING ABOUT ARUNDEL HOUSE, HIGHGATE.

THE mansion where Francis Bacon's death is supposed to have taken place on April 9th, 1626 (Easter Day), belonged to Thomas Howard, Earl Marshall. Lord Arundel, like his wife, had been brought up a Roman Catholic, and was accused of becoming a Protestant from policy. A patron of art, he led a gay Court life at home and abroad. He offended Charles I., and was prevented by that king from taking his place in the House of Lords. During my search (quite a useless one) for any mention of Francis Bacon's death in the "Lords' Journal," the public newspaper of that day, I read a lengthy report of the Appeal of the House to the King for Arundel's return. It appears that the King had a private cause of complaint against Arundel, not a State one. Arundel House stood on The Bank, as Highgate Hill was called, quite near Cromwell House, now a children's hospital. That was built by Oliver for his son-in-law Ireton, and stood opposite Lauderdale House, built by the Duke of Lauderdale in 1600, a man of ill repute, accused of plotting against Charles. Arundel House had been formerly in the possession of the Roman Catholic gentleman, Sir Thomas Cornwallis, Comptroller of the Household to Queen Mary, who received Princess Elizabeth there (1554) on her way to London, and in whose mansion she signed her first State document. The Queen was a visitor there in June, 1589. On May 1st, 1604, a splendid royal fête was held there in honour of James, Ben Jonson being employed to compose a dramatic interlude—*The Penates*—for the private entertainment of the King and Queen. Sir Thomas died at the age of 85 in 1605 at Brome in Suffolk, and in June,



1624, James "towards evening approached to Highgate and lay at the Lord of Arundel's to hunt a stag early next morning in St. John's Wood."

The mansion was taken down in 1825, nothing remaining of it now but an old wall, which I have investigated, at the back of a small house bearing the name of Arundel House in honour of old days. Until now my search for a print of the old mansion in the British Museum and elsewhere has proved unsuccessful. If any reader could aid me in my search I should be grateful.

Norden, in his Survey, 1596, calls it "a Principal Mansion," and describes it as follows:—"Upon this hill is a most pleasant dwelling, yet not so pleasant as healthful for the expert inhabitants report that divers what have long been visited with sickness not curable by physic have in a short time repaired their health by that sweet salutarie air. . . . At this plac Cornwalleys Esquire hath a very faire house, from which he may with great delight behold the statelie citie of London, Westminster, and Greenwich . . . the famous river Thames, and countrie towards the South very faire."

Gondemar, the Spanish Ambassador, retreated (1621) to Highgate "to take fresh air." Among the Harleian MSS. is a letter from Sir Thomas Cornwallis, dated "Hygat, July 16th, 1587." 1617 is the first mention I have found of the Earl of Arundel being in possession. King James was then in Scotland; Sir Francis Bacon had just been appointed Lord Keeper,\* and was left by the King at the head of the Privy Council, giving satirical Weldon occasion to say, "he occupied King's lodging at Whitehall, and the State of Royalty." In a letter from Mr. Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton we

\* Receiving the Seals in Canterbury Mansion, where he resided two years.

read :—“ The Countess of Arundel made a grand feast at Highgate to the Lord Keeper, and Lord Justices, Master of the Rolls, etc.” (“Nichol’s Progresses,” Vol. II., p. 344, and Vol. III., p. 978). It is perhaps worth mentioning that Camden describes “Arondell” as “swallow,” *i.e.*, “the gentlemen of which name do bear those birds in their coat armour.” One might almost imagine James as he approached “toward evening to Highgate and lay at the Lord of Arundel’s,” saying—

“This Castle hath a pleasant seat ; the air nimble and sweetly recommends itself unto our gentle senses.”

*First Courtier*.—“This guest of summer, the temple-haunting martlet<sup>o</sup> does approve by his loved mansionry, that the heaven’s breath smells woongly here. . . . Where they most breathe and haunt I have observed the air is delicate” (*Macbeth*, Act V. 1.)

Highgate answered to the requirements of “Arondell” as well as to those of our Shake-spear Bacon, who said such pertinent things about wholesome air, fair houses, and seats well situated on high places. Arundel House stood on a level with the dome of St. Paul’s, and was certainly not “set upon a knap of ground environed with higher hills round about it,” condemned by Bacon (“Essay of Building”).

Both Bradley and Lefuse, in their Biographies of Princess Arabella Stuart, ignore a most interesting fact alleged by two other writers. William Howitt (“Northern Heights,” p. 370) says, “Arundel House numbers amongst its chief historical associations two very different yet very interesting ones, the flight of Arabella Stuart in the reign of King James, and the death of the great Chancellor Bacon about fifteen years afterwards.”

Frederick Pricket (“History and Antiquities of High-

<sup>o</sup> “Johnson’s Dictionary,” a kind of swallow.

gate," p. 75) mentions "Arundel House, famed as the place of imprisonment of the Lady Arabella Stuart\* in 1611," and adds, "the unfortunate Lady Arabella Stuart . . . having been for some time confined at Sir Thomas Parry's House at Lambeth was removed to Arundel House at Highgate where she made her escape."

For many reasons I have long thought it more than probable that Francis Bacon retired from the world in 1626 to devote himself more particularly to literary work of an important nature, giving out that he died for the better carrying out of this scheme. Howitt and Pricket's statements with regard to Arabella making an escape from Arundel House, gave me a clue to the house being provided with easy means of escape. If Arabella Stuart found a way to elude her vigilant caretakers, and Francis Bacon followed suit and disappeared also from the same mansion, were secret passages and hiding-places in it? That this question may be answered in the affirmative there is very little doubt. We have already seen it was successively the home of two noted Roman Catholics, or, as they were then called, Recusants, Sir Thomas Cornwallis heading that list in 1587. That, according to Allan Fea ("Secret Chambers and Hiding-places"), is a sufficient guarantee that anything and everything in the way of sliding panels, double floors, trap doors, innocent-looking cupboards, the backs of which, by removing pegs, swung back into recesses, slanting tunnels, handy ropes dropping fugitives down into cellars and subterranean passages a mile or more in length, not only might, but did exist.

At the time of the Gunpowder Plot Father Garnett and his architect Owen were arrested at Hindlip Hall, Worcester. Built in 1572, it was literally riddled with

\* Lord Arundel's son was Arabella's godson, and his wife was Gilbert Sulbut's daughter.

secret chambers and passages. "Wainscoting, solid brickwork, or stone hearth were equally accommodating, and would swallow up fugitives wholesale, and close over them, to 'open sesame' again only at the hider's pleasure" (Allan Fea, p. 25).

"Owen," says Fea, "devoted the greater part of his life to constructing these places in the principal Roman Catholic houses all over England."

"With incomparable skill . . . he knew how to conduct priests to a place of safety along subterranean passages, to hide them between walls, and bury them in impenetrable recesses, and entangle them in labyrinths and a thousand windings. But what was much more difficult . . . he so disguised the entrances to these as to make them most unlike what they really were." Dunster Castle, Somersetshire, possessed a long, narrow place of concealment in one of the rooms at the *back of a bedstead*. It was no unusual thing, according to Fea, that a secret room was entered from a *principal bedroom*.

Did the "damp bed" of tradition in Arundel House effect for Francis first concealment and then his escape, landing him safe on the Resurrection Morn (a suggestive day) by a Hollow Way far from the spot of his mock funeral? It seems an inconceivable thing that one can find no hint of his funeral, or of any funeral sermon preached, search as one may. The late Dr. Garnett made efforts to help me at the British Museum in a most unsuccessful attempt to trace a first-hand account of Bacon's decease and funeral. Fuller's and Aubrey's accounts are only hearsay after all. Aubrey says Bacon died in Hobbes' arms, adding, "so Hobbes' tells me." Poor testimony after all, for might it not have been Hobbes' part to say so? Dr. Garnett looked up Howitt's "Highgate" for me, which contained the well-known fallacy of the fowl stuffed with snow and

its fatal results. He checked my hilarity by pointing to two references in a foot-note. "Wait, these," he said, "will probably give you what you want." They referred one to the "Lords' Journal" and the other to the "State Calendar" of that date. On looking them up I found the "Lords' Journal" ceased to exist at that time. The "State Calendar" contained in a News letter, "Lord St. Alban died yesterday," so Howitt's references were quite useless.

To return to Owen and his hiding-places. Robert Cecil wrote, "That great joy was caused all through the kingdom by the arrest of Owen, knowing his skill in constructing hiding-places and the innumerable number of these dark holes which he had schemed for hiding priests throughout the kingdom." Tradition exists still that from Cromwell House a subterranean passage once ran across the road to Andrew Marvel's gabled cottage, which stood opposite, The dramatic aspect of an escape such as I suggest would have commended itself to our Great Man. If he reached Muswell Hill or Mitcham, Sir Julius Cæsar's seat, by a sub-way, it might explain Fuller saying he died in the mansion of the Master of the Rolls, who, by the way, is said to have possessed the *secret of longevity*. I wonder sometimes if the preserved fowl had its own part to play in the romance, and whether it was really indurated and tinned and eaten by our scientific refugee, and whether it kept him alive in some hole or deep well till he could get safely away?

The idea of a coffin being weighted with stones and buried without his body being in it, was a scheme which had a parallel in the romantic story of a certain Eva von Trott, a court lady of Duchess Marie of Brunswick, with whom Duke *Heinrich de Jungere* fell in love. His jealous Duchess lived in the "strong Castle on the

Oker" in Wolffenbüttle, mentioned by Francis Bacon in those very words in his "State of Christendom" (1580). It was found expedient that Eva should die of plague, whereas she really escaped from the Castle well and lusty, dressed as a peasant, to another Palace, while a figure of wood lay at peace in the coffin. Years afterwards the coffin was opened and found empty. Eva's youngest son, Eitel Heinrich, was his father's favourite, who wanted the Pope to legitimise him, so as to allow of his succession to the dukedom. But this Eitel withstood, saying: "If Almighty God had wished me to be a Prince, I would have been one, as that was not the case, I shall remain in the position in which He has put me." Duke Julius, to whom Francis Bacon refers in his Political Tract, thought much of his half-brother Eitel, and welcomed him at his Court, with which Francis Bacon seems to have been familiar. Naturally the story of Eitel's mother's mock death and ingenious burial would have been a matter of much interest to the young diplomatist Francis. Neither Eva nor Eitel died till 1597. Eitel was uncle to Duke Heinrich Julius, Queen Anne of Denmark's brother-in-law.

A certain Sir Nicholas Trott, of Gray's Inn, is credited by Hepworth Dixon with being a cousin of Mr. Francis Bacon. If he were a son of Eitel he would be cousin to the Princes Henry and Charles, sons of James. Who was Sir Nicholas Trott of Gray's Inn, whose whole fortune had been engaged in 1597 for the service of Mr. F. Bacon, the year of the death of Eitel Heinrich of Brunswick?

Mrs. Pott has reasons for thinking that, after his escape from England and its civil war, Bacon lived in Germany to a *very great age*. If we study his "*Historia Vita et Mortis*," we shall find an extraordinary interest exhibited in longevity, many examples being given of

human life extending long over the normal three-score years and ten.

Let these things be enquired into.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

---

## CHEVERIL THE LAWYER.

**O**N reading through the Rev. Walter Begley's "Is it Shakespeare?" I was pleased to find (pages 83—93) an able statement of the theory that Ovid junior in Ben Jonson's "Poetaster" is a caricature of young Francis Bacon.\* In my copy (The Mermaid Series, edited by Brinsley Nicholson and C. H. Herford), Ovid junior is pronounced to be *Ben Jonson*, which (before reading "Is it Shakespeare?") I had altered to Francis Bacon. What connection there can be between Ovid junior and Ben Jonson is certainly a puzzle, and the editors of this edition do not let us into the secret. Horace is undoubtedly Ben Jonson, but no suggestion is made as to who is the *Æsculapius* who administers the pills. Marcus Ovidius (the father of the young law student who finds that, like Bacon, "the contemplative planet" carries him away) undoubtedly represents Lord Burghley. Although, from the letters which have come down to us, Burghley seems to have been sympathetic towards Bacon's "rare and unaccustomed suit," we cannot judge exactly what attitude he adopted upon discovering his nephew's wish to avoid the law in order to carry out his "vast contemplative ends." I do not overlook his letter to Burghley dated 6th May, 1586, where he says:—

\* This suggestion was previously made in "Shakespeare-Bacon, An Essay," by Mr. I. M. Smeaton, published in 1899 (Swan, Sonnenschiew and Co). "Is it Shakespeare?" was published in 1903.—ED. BACONIANA.

"I take it as an undoubted sign of your Lordship's favour unto me that being hardly informed of me you took occasion rather of *good advice* than of evil opinion thereby."

His Lordship's "admonition" was probably more severe than we can gather from this letter.

In the "Poetaster" I. i., Ovid is discovered in his study writing poetry in the Shakesperean vein :—

*Ovid.*—"Then, when this body falls in funeral fire,  
My name shall live, and my best part aspire."  
It shall go so.

Then the servant Luscus enters, and gives warning of the approach of Ovid senior.

*Ovid, sen.*—"Your name shall live" indeed sir! you say true: but how infamously, how scorned and contemned in the eyes and ears of the best and gravest Romans; that, you think not on; you never so much as dream of that. Are these the fruits of all my travail and expenses? Is this the scope and aim of thy studies? are these the hopeful courses, wherewith I have so long flattered my expectation from thee? Verses? Poetry? Ovid, whom I thought to see the pleader, become Ovid the play-maker?

*Ovid, jun.*—No, sir.

*Ovid, sen.*—Yes, sir. I hear of a tragedy of yours coming forth for the common players there, called "Medea."  
. . . What? shall I have my son a stager now? An angle for players? . . . Methinks, if nothing else, yet this alone, the very reading of the public edicts, should fright thee from commerce with them [*i.e.* the players] and give thee distaste enough of their actions. But this betrays what a student you are; this argues your proficiency in the law!

*Ovid, jun.*—They wrong me, sir, and do abuse you more,  
That blow your ears with these untrue reports.  
*I am not known upon the open stage,  
Nor do I traffic in their theatres.*  
Indeed, I do acknowledge, at request



Of some near friends, and honourable Romans,  
I have begun a poem of that nature.

*Ovid, sen.*—You have, sir, a poem? And where is it? That's the law you study!

*Ovid, jun.*—Cornelius Gallus borrowed it to read.

*Ovid, sen.*—Cornelius Gallus! There's another gallant too hath drunk of the same poison; and Tibullus and Propertius. But these are gentlemen of means, and revenues now. *Thou art a younger brother, and hast nothing but thy bare exhibition*; which I protest shall be bare indeed, if thou forsake not these unprofitable by-courses, and that timely too. Name me a profest poet, that his poetry did ever afford him so much as a competency.

It is asserted in "Is it Shakespeare?" that Scene IV. of act iv. (Scene VIII. in old editions) between Ovid and Julia ("at her chamber window") is "a striking, a clever parody on *Romeo and Juliet*, and so fits in with the rest of Ben Jonson's allusions throughout his 'Poetaster,' and gives us good ground for thinking that he, at least, as early as 1602, had got to know that Bacon was the author of *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Richard II.*"

The allusion to Bacon-Shake-speare is strengthened by the paraphrase of the lines from Ovid's "Amores" prefixed to *Venus and Adonis* in the lawyer-poet's soliloquy (Act I. i.)

Kneel hinds to trash: me let bright Phœbus swell,  
With cups full flowing from the Muses' well.

I see it is affirmed that it was Bacon who stirred up the authorities against the "Poetaster," Jonson's epigrams on Cheveril, the lawyer being quoted in support of this contention:—

EPIGRAM LIV.

Cheveril cries out my verses libels are;  
And threatens the Star-Chamber and the Bar.

## Cheveril the Lawyer.

What are thy petulant pleadings, Cheveril, then,  
That quit'st the cause so oft, and rail'st at men.

## EPIGRAM XXXVII.

*On Cheveril the Lawyer.*

No cause, nor client fat, will Cheveril lcese,  
But as they come, on both sides he takes fees,  
And pleaseth both ; for while he melts his grease  
For this ; that wins, for whom he holds his peace.

It escaped the notice of the Rev. Walter Begley that the name F. BACON appears in this epigram, as I have marked it. Can this be another coincidence ?

Tucca tells Ovid that he will be happy as a lawyer "when it shall be in the power of thy *cheveril* conscience to do right or wrong at thy pleasure."

If Luscus is Shakspeare, support is given to the tradition of his minding horses.

*Ovid, sen.* (to Luscus).—Sirrah, go get my horses ready. You'll still be prating.

*Tuc.*—Do, you perpetual stinkard, do, go ; talk to tapsters and ostlers, you slave ; they are i' your element, go.

With reference to the love scene between the *banished* Ovid and Julia there is a footnote in my copy of the "Poetaster" by the editor of the Mermaid edition reading as follows:—"Gifford rightly calls this 'a ridiculous love scene,' and 'not much in the manner of Ovid.' I should say, not at all."

R. EAGLE.

## "I AM THAT I AM."

**I**N "The Mystery of Francis Bacon," Mr. Smedley says (commenting upon the "Mente Videbor" emblem in Peacham's "Minerva Britannia") "At a very early age, probably before he was 12, he had conceived the idea that he would imitate God, and would hide his works in order that they might be found out—that he would be seen only by his mind and that his image should be concealed." There can be no harm in repeating the evidence upon which this contention is based. In the preface to the "Novum Organum," Bacon writes:—

"Whereas of the sciences, which regard nature, the Holy Philosopher declares that 'it is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but it is the glory of the King to find it out.' Even as though the Divine Nature took pleasure in the innocent and kindly sport of children playing at hide-and-seek, and vouchsafed of his kindness and goodness to admit the human spirit for his play-fellow in that game." This idea was impressed very deeply upon Bacon's mind, for in the "Promus of Formularies" (1594—6), he had jotted down:—

"The glory of God is to conceale a thing and the glory of man is to fynd out a thing."

Again in the preface to the "Advancement of Learning" (1640, Wats' translation) we find:—

"For of the knowledges which contemplate the works of Nature, the holy Philosopher hath said expressly: that the glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the glory of the King is to find it out: as if the Divine Nature, according to the innocent and sweet play of children, which hide themselves to the end they may be found; took delight to hide his works, to the end they

might be found out ; and of his indulgence and goodness to mankind, had chosen the Soule of man to be his Play-fellow in this game."

On page 45 of the same work, the identical fancy is again repeated.

In the Authorised version of The Bible, Exodus iii., 13, 14, there is written :—

13. And Moses said unto God, Behold *when* I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you ; and they shall say to me, What is His name ? what shall I say unto them ?

14. And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM, and He said, Thus shalt they say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

In Sonnet CXXI. Shakespeare writes :—

No.—I am that I am ; and they that level  
At my abuses reckon up their own.

Curiously enough this is also in connection with invisibility to the eyes of men.

'Tis better to be vile, than vile esteemed,  
When not to be receives reproach of being,  
And the just pleasure lost, which is so deem'd  
Not by our feeling, but by others' *seeing*.  
For why should others' false adulterate eyes  
Give salutation to my sportive blood ?  
Or on my frailties why are frailer spies,  
Which in their wills count bad what I think good ?  
No.—*I am that I am* ; and they that level  
At my abuses, reckon up their own :  
I may be straight, though they themselves be bevel ; \*

\* Bevel—coined by Shakespeare from the old French " Buveau " (a kind of compass, but with a straight and a slanting pole at a fixed angle). The word does not appear to have come into general use until the beginning of the 19th century since Malone (1790) quotes Steevens for an explanation :—" Bevel—*i.e.*, *crooked* a term used only, I believe, by masons and joiners."

By their rank thoughts *my deeds must not be shown* ;  
 Unless this general evil they maintain,—  
 All men are bad, and in their badness reign.

This Sonnet has been quoted by short-sighted orthodoxy as proving the author to have been a man of ungovernable animal passions. Anything will be accepted so long as it can be reconciled with "William the Conqueror,"—the hero of the escapade recorded in Manningham's Diary! It would appear, however, that William Shagsper did not take great precaution that his "sportive" deeds should "not be shown"!

What does this Sonnet mean? Attention must first of all be directed towards the elucidation of "sportive blood," and assuming the Baconian authorship, difficulties at once disappear. Poesie was esteemed vile, and contemporary literature tells us that on account of "the scorn and ordinary disgrace offered unto poets," such writings were usually published anonymously, or with some other name to them. Dramatic poesie was even viler esteemed, and such "deeds must not be shown." Of *Poesy* Bacon writes: "For as all knowledge is the exercise and work of the mind, so poesie may be regarded as its *sport*. With these individuals and with this material (history, poesie, and philosophy) the human mind perpetually exercises itself and *sometimes sports*."

In a letter to Sir Tobie Matthew, Bacon writes:—

"I have sent you some copies of my book of the 'Advancement,' which you desired, and a little *work of my recreation* which you desired not."

The association with Poesie is again referred to as "sport" in John Davies' Sonnet (addressed "To the royall, ingenious and all learned Knight, Sir Francis Bacon"), in the lines:—

And to thy health in Helicon to drinke  
 As to her Bellamour the Muse is wont:

For thou dost her embazom; and, dost use  
Her company for *sport* twixt grave affaires.

Ben Jonson in his lines prefixed to the first Folio makes comparison between the author Shakespeare and "sporting Kyd." There is certainly nothing particularly "sporting" in Kyd's writings.

In Sonnet CXXI. we find "Shakespeare's" declaration of his concealment so far as his "sportive" creations are concerned, and in CXXII., CXXIII. and CXXIV., the confidence that Time will restore his "name and memory."

Both Shakespeare and Bacon were impressed with the concealment of the Divine Being who "took delight to hide his works, to the end to have them found out."

The idea of the "Mente Videbor" emblem (which shows a hand protruding from behind a curtain, which is drawn to conceal the figure) is, I think, derived from the same source:—

"I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments" (Exodus vi. 6). Thus has Bacon left his "memorial unto all generations."

R. EAGLE.

---

### DID BACON DIE IN 1626?

**M**AY I be permitted a few further notes on this question? It may be perfectly true that Bacon died as stated by Rawley. On the other hand, he may have only become dead to the world on that day, and that we are faced with the solution of yet another of the problems he set for the justification of inductive methods of reasoning. "The glory of God is to conceal a thing, the glory of the King is to find it out."

1. The letters to Jane Lady Cornwallis (who became

Lady Jane Bacon by a subsequent marriage) do not help the point very much.

2. The announcement in April, 1626, "My Lo. St Albans is dead and buried," may have been only repetition of the unauthoritative talk of the moment or a permissible misstatement from a person desirous of facilitating a carefully planned yet harmless escape.

3. But the letter was not written by Mr. Thomas Meautys, who had been Bacon's private secretary, and was then Clerk to the Council of Charles I. It came from that gentleman's cousin of the same name, who had, close upon the date of Bacon's last will, 19th December, 1625, lent Bacon £300, and, as a creditor who was interested in preserving what could be saved of Bacon's estate, had a claim to early information. He was subsequently made joint administrator.

4. The ex-secretary and Lady Jane were brother and sister, the latter marrying for her second husband Nathaniel, son of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, and the former marrying later on than 1626 for his second wife Anne, a daughter of Sir Nathaniel. Brother and sister, therefore, both married children of Sir Nathaniel Bacon. It was (see p. 258 BACONIANA, 1679) the ex-secretary (and not the writer of the letter) who erected the monument in St. Michael's, Gorhambury.

5. The reference to the secretary in the cousin's letter, namely that he—the ex-secretary—was off to the Low Countries for six weeks, is to an extent remarkable.

If Bacon retired to the Continent in April, 1626, his friend and former secretary—this "man of immense energy and business organisation" (to quote from Mrs. Buntzen)—would have been a most suitable travelling companion.

6. I have already noticed the curious references to Bacon's "sickness" in the "Translation of Psalms," and,

again, in the "Apophthegms," both printed in 1625. In the 1625 will Bacon again referred to his "sickness." Yet in his private letters about that period he wrote of improving health, and indicated a happy and merry frame of mind.

7. Arundel House, Highgate, where this "sickness" took apparently a final shape, formerly belonged to Sir William Cornwallis, Lady Jane's first husband. He was a recusant, but a rich man, and friend of Robert Earl of Essex, whom he accompanied to Ireland in 1599. Queen Elizabeth visited the house in 1589; James I. in 1604. As the house of a recusant, it probably had hiding places and secret passages for escape.

8. Rawley's conduct over this "death" business was very perplexing. I have already alluded to some incidents. Why, if Bacon were dead, Rawley should not have published the "Life" with the Latin edition of Bacon's works in 1638, instead of deferring it until 1657, is difficult to understand.

The use, moreover, of the word *mortuus* on the portrait in the "Sylva Sylvarum," 1627, may have been correct Latin, yet was consistent with a double meaning, such as that Bacon became "dead to the world" on 9th April, 1626. And if I may be permitted to reaffirm my confidence in the existence of the biliteral cipher and its, on the whole, fairly correct decipherment, why did Rawley, in the "Miscellany Works," 1629, write in cipher of Bacon as then dead? If he were not dead, the cipher might have been entrusted with the truth. Of course, he may not have then known the contrary (so that the blunder in the "Sylva" preface was accidental only), or fearing that through aid of the "De Augustis" (1623) instructions, someone would soon decipher the biliteral, he dared not write the truth about his old master in that form of cipher. We must



bear in mind the large and extensive use of cipher writing in that period, and the many experts engaged in the art of deciphering. Rawley might well have been in fear.

PARKER WOODWARD.

---

"RESUSCITATIO," 1657.

IT is to be hoped that some person experienced in the evolution and history of the art of letterpress printing may bring his knowledge to bear upon the above book. Compiled in an age of cipher writing, it would be interesting to ascertain whether the "Resuscitatio" is merely what it outwardly purports to be—a collection of tractates, speeches and letters by Bacon—or is incidentally or primarily the vehicle of some important cipher communications.

The "Resuscitatio" bears evidence of very careful preparation, and a long period from Bacon's "Dying Day" elapsed before it was published.

The reasons given for publication are not very clear. The tractates, according to the preface, were directed to be preserved from perishing, and to have been reposed in some private shrine or library; so that in publishing them as he did, Rawley disobeyed his Lordship's wishes.

In "The Lost Manuscripts," Mrs. Gallup printed a decipher of a biliteral cypher inserted by Rawley in this edition of the "Resuscitatio."

The decipher is difficult to understand, but it would appear that Rawley introduced a triliteral cypher as well as the biliteral. He also refers to a track set, but at that date not yet followed nor yet seen. The "Resuscitatio," 1657, contains the first essay towards a Life of Bacon.

The curious way in which it is printed leads one to

think it conveys other messages in other cypher than the biliteral.

The "U" in Honourable being the fifth letter is wrong fount, and is rendered by an inverted "N."

In the word "his" three lines below, the "i" is remarkable in that it has a stroke on each side, so that it is shaped like an arrow, and points to the letter A in Francis. The Elizabethan alphabet had twenty-four letters, N being the first of the second twelve. It would almost appear that in the cypher, if there be one, a letter "A" represents "N"; "B" represents "O," and so on.

The "Life" is printed partly in Roman, partly in Italic type, but seems to follow no apparent rule of selection.

A topographical name is in Roman type in one place; for instance, "Highgate," while a similar place name, for instance, "Strand," is in Italic. Nouns, adverbs, adjectives are sometimes in the one type, sometimes in the other.

Another odd feature is the extraordinary number of capital letters.

So is the large frequency in the use of punctuation marks, in many cases certainly unnecessary for the sense of the printed matter.

These punctuation marks, whether commas, full stops, colons or semi-colons, are in three or more sizes. These variations may serve as indicia of the letters in the preceding or following words, forming part of some cypher statement or messages. There is also an unusual use of words in brackets, generally beginning with the word "as." These interjected words could mostly have been omitted without damage to the narration. There are differences in the cut of the brackets themselves, which differences may again indicate the letters of the internal message to be selected.

It may be that these numerous variations have no

real significance, and persons expert in the lore of printing may be able to explain that they mean nothing but the result of badly cut type. On the other hand, if small variations of type enabled a biliteral cypher to be constructed, such an explanation would hardly carry conviction. It is manifest that in an age of cypher writing the desire to convey cypher messages in print could very easily be carried out by a clever arrangement of letters indicated by capitals and by differences in types, and particularly by differences in punctuation marks.

Deciphering, according to the late Mr. Bidder, Q.C., requires for its success a quick power of perception and a readiness with difficulties.

To this must be conjoined a willingness to plod and experiment and considerable patience.

In view of the valuable deposits of documents which Bacon would seem to have made, one may well quote to those willing to try deciphering, the lines which Bacon wrote:—

"There is a tide in the affairs of man which,  
Taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."

PARKER WOODWARD.

---

## "THE ATHENÆUM" OWES AN APOLOGY.

"THE ATHENÆUM" has been regarded as a journal in which may be placed reliance on statements made on literary subjects. It was, therefore, with some surprise that a correspondent read in a review appearing in it, on "Shakespeare and Stratford," by Mr. Henry C. Shelley, the following paragraph: "The author states that no early writers refer to 'Shakespeare's birthplace'; that few of his contem-

poraries even knew he belonged to Stratford-on-Avon until the appearance of the First Folio. Indeed, few were aware of the connection of Shakespeare with Stratford-on-Avon until Dugdale appeared in 1656. This is a mistake. Before the latter date Davenant, William Camden, James Shirley, Samuel Sheppard, and several less known writers had definitely associated Shakespeare with Stratford; not, it is true, with the Henley Street House."

A letter was addressed to the editor of the "Athenæum," pointing out that it would be of considerable interest to many of the readers of his journal if the reviewer would give references to where these allusions might be found. The Editor courteously replied, "Your question is of interest, but I hardly feel justified in occupying our reviewer's time in answering it, especially at a time when he is out of reach of books. Mrs. Stopes' book on the Bacon-Shakespeare question supplies, I think, some of the evidence required."

Mr. Shirley is correct in his statement, and the reviewer is wrong. Nowhere have Davenant, William Camden, or Samuel Sheppard, or any less known writers definitely associated Shakespeare with Stratford before Dugdale's "Antiquities of Warwickshire" appeared in 1656, with the sole exception mentioned by Mr. Shirley of the First Folio, 1623.

The only reference which Mrs. Stopes gives has no separate historical value. It is as follows:—

1647. "The flowing compositions of the then-expired Sweet Swan of Avon—Shakspere.

"James Shirley, Dedicatory Epistle of Ten Players.  
"(Beaumont & Fletcher's works)."

This is simply a quotation from Jonson's panegyric prefixed to the First Folio. Shagspere had been dead and buried for seven years before there is any suggestion

put forth that Stratford-on-Avon was in any way associated with the author of the plays. Then it is to be found in the two expressions, "Sweet swan of Avon," and "Thy Stratford monument." There is after this a break of thirty-three years before Dugdale produces an engraving of the Stratford Monument with its curious inscription :

Judicio Pylum, Genio Socratem, Arte Maronem,  
Terra Tegit, Populus Maeret, Olympus Habet.

Not a word about the man to whose memory the monument is erected being either dramatist, poet or actor! But his judgment is likened to that of Ulysees, his genius to that of Socrates, and his art to that of Virgil. To say the least of it, the inscription is a curious one to be found on the tomb of the Stratford man. At the date of its erection, which was probably about 1622, who had discerned the existence of these qualities even in the author of the great dramas? This inscription is by no means one of the least important links in the chain of evidence as to the Baconian authorship. It should, at least, have the effect of setting some of the distinguished men of letters thinking.

## THE STRATFORD PLAYER.

## HIS NAME.

**N**UMEROUS though the discussions have been on the above subject, there has, as far as I know, never been any attempt to treat the matter etymologically, and to trace the Shaksper or Shaxper name, as in the case of other surnames, to its origin. Perhaps a few words devoted to this object may not be thrown away.

What, then, is, or was, the Player's real name, and whence was it derived? That it was not "Shakespeare"—which, indeed, is no family name at all, but a mere literary compound, "Shake-speare"—is so evident, and now, as I think, so universally admitted, except by those whom no evidence can convince, that I will not stop to discuss the point, but proceed to inquire what was the name the Player went by amongst those who knew him in the flesh. This is not difficult to determine, for, though the name is said to have been written in some sixty different ways, these are only some sixty different attempts to express on paper the manner in which the several writers of it heard it pronounced. For, as in those days the art of writing was not common, a scribe taking down a man's name had nothing else to guide him but its pronunciation by the owner or some one else who was acquainted with it, and as one scribe's ear might not always agree with another's on the "catching" of the sound, differences in the registering of the sound phonetically would naturally occur. Hence the great variety of forms in which one and the same name (in sound) might appear.

But in the examination of the no less than sixty forms in which the Actor's name, or that of his family, has been written, two clear results emerge, namely that the first syllable always represents the sound now given to

"Shack," or "Shak," or "Shax" (never to "Shake"), and the second to "per," or "pur" (never to "pere," as in spere).

Phonetically, the name of the Stratford Player may, therefore, be said to be fairly represented by any or all of the various forms it has taken in writing, as Shaksper, Shaxper, Shaksber, Shaxper, and the rest, but which of these is the more correct must be determined by its derivation, which has not yet been considered.

As to this, the word "shack" I have found in the course of my reading (though, unfortunately, I have not taken note of and cannot at this moment give, the references in books) stands for a "cot," a "hut," or "shanty," and is still used in that sense among the navvies for their temporary dwellings, as also by the campers-out in the prairies of Canada and the U.S.A. A "shack's-ber," therefore, should be (and, I believe, is) nothing more than a shack's-dweller, a dweller in a "shack," equivalent to a cottager, the Saxon term "bûr" (appearing in "neighbour," &c.), meaning a dweller, from the Gothic "bûan," to dwell.

And, this being the derivation of the word, it follows that the correct spelling of it, as I submit, should be "Shacksber," or (by the well-known law of consonant mutation) "Shacksper," or (omitting the unnecessary consonant c) "Shaksper."

And this is the form in which, with the addition of a final "e," the name appears in the Stratford Church Baptismal Register, but the final "e" is probably but the flourish usually appended to the German or old English "r," and does not affect the pronunciation.

"Shaksper," therefore (the correct form of the Player's name), I think, is not "Shakespeare," and has no sort of connection with it. It has no "warlike sound" about it, to use old Fuller's phrase, as the famous pseudonym—taken from the "Hasti-vibrans" of

Pallas—has. It speaks to us of much humbler things, though that, of course, is no reproach to it. Halliwell-Phillips tells us that "Shaksperes" were very numerous in Warwickshire, which is not to be wondered at, for did not Warwickshire contain the extensive Forest of Arden, where "shacks," or huts, or shanties, would "doubtless," as Sir Sidney Lee would say, be plentifully provided for the woodmen and others dwelling therein? No doubt the "cottage" which Rosalind found there was a "shack" (*As You Like It*, II. iv.), and the dweller therein would be a Shacks-ber or Shaksper.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—As the objects of the Bacon Society include a complete "record of all works of contemporaries in which reference is made to Bacon," I enclose the accompanying lines found in Francis Osborn's "Advice to a Son," 1873 edition, Part II., p. 150. It is suggestive to find copious coffee "sprayings" in the pages indicated.

Yours truly,

"A SNAPPER-UP OF UNCONSIDERED TRIFLES."

"My memory neither doth, nor, I believe, possible ever can, direct me to an example more splendid in this kind than Lord Bacon, Earl of St. Albans, who in all companies did appear a good proficient, if not a master, in those arts entertained for the subject of everyone's discourse. So as I dare maintain, without the least affectation of flattery or hyperbole, that his most casual talk deserveth to be written: as I have been told that his first or foulest copies required no great labour to render them competent for the nicest judgments. A high perfection attainable only by use, and treating with every man in his respective profession, and what he was most versed in! So as I have heard him entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs, and at another time outcant a London chirurgeon. Thus did he not only learn himself, but gratify such as taught him; who looked upon their callings as honored through his notice. Nor did an easy falling into argument—not unjustly taken for a blemish in the most—appear less than an ornament in him: the ears of the bearers receiving more gratification than trouble; and



so not less sorry when he came to conclude than displeased with any did interrupt him. Now, this general knowledge he had in all things, husbanded by his wit, and dignified by so majestical a carriage he was known to own, struck such an awful reverence in those he questioned, that they durst not conceal the most intrinsic part of their mysteries from, for fear of appearing ignorant or saucy. All of which rendered him no less necessary than admirable at the council table, where in reference to impositions, monopolies, &c., the meanest manufactures were an usual argument; and, as I have heard, did in this baffle the Earl of Middlesex that was born and bred a citizen. Yet without any great (if at all) interrupting his other studies, as is not hard to be imagined of a quick apprehension in which he was admirable."

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The first play exhibited in England before James I. was at Wilton, Lord Pembroke's home, and it was presented by Shakespeare's Company " (*"Life and Times of Arabella Stuart,"* by M. Lefuse, p. 153). A very near relation of the late Lord Pembroke told me that at Wilton in an old chest is preserved a letter from the Lord Pembroke of those old days, saying (as far as I can remember), "The man Shakespeare comes to-night." Cannot a sight of this letter be obtained and possibly a transcript made of it? Yours sincerely, ALICIA A. LEITH.

[Application was made some time ago to Lord Pembroke for permission to inspect the letter, but it cannot now be found.—ED. B.]

---

Date of Bacon's Death.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The Thomas Meautys who, according to Mrs. Buntens article, used the words "My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried" in a letter written about April, 1626, to Lady Jane Bacon, formerly Cornwallis, was not the Thomas Meautys who was Bacon's friend and secretary, and who erected the monument in St. Michael's Church. This should account for the unemotional statement. Thomas Meautys the secretary was the brother of Lady Jane Bacon, who, curiously enough, was reported in the letter to be going to the Low Countries. Was he escorting his escaping old master? The Earl of Arundel's house at Highgate had, prior to 1617, belonged to Sir William Cornwallis, a recusant, and possessed secret passages, so Miss Leith informs me.

Amongst the decipherings published by Mrs. Gallup under the title of "The Lost Manuscripts," is a cipher placed by Rawley in the Miscellany Works, 1629, containing the words, "We will give

F. Bacon our devoted service, although his own labours have at length ceased and he sleeps in the tombe."

One would hardly think Rawley would place such a statement in cipher unless he had been kept in ignorance and honestly believed Bacon to be dead or feared an early de-coding of the cipher, and therefore repeated by way of precaution an allegation he knew to be technically untrue. This appears to have been Rawley's first essay in ciphering, except a little bit in the *Apophthegmes*, 1625, and he may have been nervous.

PARKER WOODWARD.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—It is seldom that two articles appear in one magazine which contradict each other, but I find this is the case in the January 1914 number of *BACONIANA*.

This shows the Editor is willing to air all views; but is it not true that *one fact* is better than a whole bag of conjectures, even though the latter are cleverly arranged by a lawyer accustomed to "plead"? I allude to Mr. Parker Woodward's article of twelve pages, arguing that Bacon did not die in 1626, as against Mrs. A. C. Buntin's three pages, showing by the best proof possible that Bacon's heir and former Secretary wrote a letter saying, "My Lord St. Albans is dead and buried"; this letter being written about a fortnight after Bacon's death towards the end of April, 1626.

Before that time Bacon was in leisurcly retirement from the busy world, and could spend his time as he liked. In fact, had he continued to write further histories, and books of science signed with his name, it is probable that his earnings might have brought in more money to pay his creditors. To pretend to die would have been an unworthy subterfuge to give his heirs the whole disagreeable task of disentangling his involved affairs, and leaving the trustees at the mercy of the clamouring creditors.

This we cannot believe Bacon would stoop to do. The letter quoted by Mr. Woodward, which was dictated by Bacon to his Secretary, and addressed to the Earl of Arundel, shows no desire to end his life, or to disappear.

Nor can we believe that Bacon, desirous to know in what estimation he was held by men of letters, pretended to die, so that he might read what Mr. Woodward calls "dirges of sorrow."

In the October number of 1913, Mrs. A. C. Buntin brought forward several printed notices of contemporaries, and others who wrote upon Bacon's death and burial, while Mr. Woodward has failed to find any such printed proof of a later date for the death, and his "considerations" are merely "speculations."

Mrs. Pott asserts that Bacon lived to the great age of 108, but what we know of his delicate health precludes that conclusion, and no positive proof has been shown to justify this idea.

Mr. Woodward is right in talking of "blundering Rawley," for

this weak old man was not one of the "literati," and shows unmistakably how frightened he was to write any disagreeable facts; and his memory also sadly failed him, so that no details of such a great man as Bacon was, are put down in his memoirs, much to our grief.

Mr. Woodward is hard to convince against his will, but he must search still further, and must remember that the world looks for "facts" and not "speculations."

I remain, A LOVER OF FACTS.

Miss A. A. Leith sends the following extract from the familiar letters of JAMES HOWELL, which bears upon the same subject.

LETTER 8.

(To Dr. Pritchard.)

SIR,—Since I was beholden to you for your many favours in Oxford, I have not heard from you (*ne gry quidem*) I pray let the wonted correspondence be now reviv'd, and receive new vigour between us.

My Lord Chancellor Bacon is lately dead of a long languishing weakness; he died so poor that he scarce left money to bury him, which tho' he had a great wit, did argue no great wisdom; it being one of the essential properties of a wise man, to provide for the main chance. I have read, that it had been the fortunes of all poets commonly to die beggars; but for an orator, a lawyer, and philosopher, as he was, to die so, 'tis rare. It seems the same fate befell him that attended Demosthenes, Seneca, and Cicero (all great men) of whom, the two first fell by corruption. The fairest diamond may have a flaw in it, but I believe he died poor out of a contempt of the pelf of fortune, as also out of an excess of generosity, which appear'd, as in divers other passages, so once when the King had sent him a stag, he sent up for the under-keeper, and having drunk the King's health to him in a great silver-gilt bowl, he gave it to him for his fee.

He writ a pitiful letter to King James, not long before his death, and concludes:—"Help me, dear Sovereign Lord and Master, and pity me so far, that I who have been born to a *Bag*, be not now in my age forc'd in effect to bear a *wallet*; nor that I who desire to live to study, may be driven to study to live." Which words in my opinion, argued a little abjection of spirit, as his former letter to the Prince did of profaneness, wherein he hop'd that as the father was his creator, the son will be his redeemer. I write not this to derogate from the noble worth of the Lord Viscount Verulam, who was a rare man; a man *Reconditæ scientiæ*, and *ad salutem literarum natus*, and I think the eloquentest that was born in this isle. They say he shall be the last Lord Chancellor, as Sir Edward Coke was the last Lord Chief Justice of England; for ever since they have been termed Lord Chief Justices of the King's-bench: so hereafter they shall

be only Keepers of the Great Seal, which for title and office, are deposable ; but they say the Lord Chancellor's title is indelible.

I was lately at Gray's-Inn with Sir Eubule, and he desir'd me to remember him to you, as I do also salute *Meum Pritchardum ex inis praccordiis, vale* (Greek here follows).

Yours affectionately, while

J. H.

London, 6 January, 1625.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In Mrs. Bunten's interesting article, entitled "Jottings on Lord Bacon," in the October BACONIANA, an extract is given from a "History of the Reign of Charles I.," dated 1656, which, on the face of it, seems to leave no doubt that Viscount St. Albans did die, as commonly supposed, in 1626 ; but things are not always what they seem, and I shall be glad if you can find space in your columns for another possible explanation.

Mrs. Bunten herself gives the clue by remarking that "Any student of the original editions of Lord Bacon's works would take this book for a companion volume to Bacon's 'Henry VII.' though published thirty-two years after that history appeared. It is a thin folio, printed with exactly the same variety of type that strikes the reader as being so strange in Bacon's history, with the double lines for marginal notes, and some of the head-pieces of ornamentation exactly similar."

Now let us assume for the moment that the actual date of Bacon's death is, as some people believe—myself among the number—one of the many mysteries connected with that great man, and that he did not really die till 1668. In that case, the "History of Charles I." may have been, and almost certainly was, as "any student would take it to be," a companion volume to the "Henry VII." written by Bacon himself. What, then, is the real meaning of the story he gives us that when "his ancient servant," Sir Thomas Meautys, who erected the monument in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, was buried in 1649, "it was his lot to be inhumed so nigh his lord's sepulchre that, in the forming of his grave, part of the viscount's body was exposed to view, which being spyed by a doctor of physick, he demanded the head be given him, and did most shamefully disport himself with that shell which was somewhile the continent of so vast treasure of knowledge."

The explanation is simple. No doubt all this did happen exactly as narrated, except that the body was not, as everyone assumed, his lordship's. We can imagine that the words "most shamefully" were a touch of true feeling and that he gladly availed himself of the incident, then but 7 years old, in order to baffle any possible keen-scented curiosity as to the identity of the author of the book on which he was engaged.

Yours faithfully,

ERNEST UDNY.

93, Linden Gardens, W., November 3rd, 1913.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

You courteously gave me an opportunity to examine four 16th century books from your private collection, viz.,

"Bishop's Beautiful Blossoms," by John Bishop .. .. .	pub. 1577
"The French Academy," by Pierre de la Primaudaye ... ..	pub. 1586
"The Dial of Princes," by Ludowicke Lloide .. .. .	" 1586
"The Felicitee of Man, by Sir Richard Barckley .. .. .	" 1598

I think there is no doubt as to their common authorship; they show a variety of care and uncare, but the same prompting mind, the same purpose, design, and "handwriting." They read to me as though they were *studies* of the "prentice hand" [but what a "prentice"] of the great artist diligently and thoroughly gathering up his material for big work—making "essaies" into history and human nature, not *yet* with mind and imagination aglow with divine passion; the furnace of that glorious fire was *then yet* to be kindled to its whiter heat, and the material gathered and garnered in these book storehouses was destined to be consumed, transformed, and re-created by the alchemy of his genius into the perfect poetry of plays like the *Tempest*.

In the "Dial of Princes" in the last fifteen lines of Address to the Reader, it says, "For the Gymnophosists of India the Prophetes in Egypt . . . are now more famous and renowned being dead than they being alive were envied and slandered," &c., &c. It concludes with a few tactful, deferential words similar to those found in some of the prefaces and epilogues of the Shakespeare Plays. Compare the above with last few lines of Bacon's "History of Henry 7th," and we find "*In that he dwelleth more richly dead in the monument of his Tombe than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces.*" I could wish he did the like in this monument of his Fame." He then goes on with his customary form of graceful self-depreciation while in front of the greater importance of his subject—the genuine self-abnegation of the true artist, anxious first to present and exalt his ideal undistracted to the attention of his audience—the actor-artist—showing his dramatic sense. Turn the object of our admiration any way, he comes out consistent and always fascinating.

May the hypothesis contained in these notes on these extremely valuable old books soon be demonstrated to the satisfaction of all Baconians.

H. J. HADRILL.

Northwood, Chislehurst, December 4th, 1913.

## The Writer of Weekly Accounts.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Sir Edward Durning-Lawrence, in his book *Bacon is Shakespeare*, says, with reference to *The Great Assises* of Willter's—

"William Shakespeare is 'The Writer of Weekly Accounts.' This exactly describes him, for the only literature for which he was responsible was the accounts sent out by his clerk or attorney."

This statement, however, cannot be taken as a correct reading, for in the charge made against this malefactor he is said to be :—

"He who weekly did pretend  
Accounts of certain news abroad to send,  
He was accus'd, that he with pamphlets vain  
The art of lying had sought to maintain."

I came across lately in the British Museum a newspaper with the title of "The Weekly Account," dated 1645, "containing special and remarkable passages from both houses of Parliament." I also found news-sheets entitled

Mercurius Britannicus	..	...	..	..	1645
Mercurius Civicus	..	..	..	..	1644
Mercurius Anlicus	...	..	..	..	1642
The Scottish Dove	...	..	...	..	1644

All these names are used to designate malefactors arraigned at the "Assises," and it might be interesting to trace the exact connection if this has not been done already.

F. LOCKHART CLARKE.

## Ignoto.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The essay on the above subject by Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame is, indeed, admirable; but is he not mistaken in treating the A1 A1 Cipher Code as a standard Baconian system, seeing that it is not in any way a secret one? It certainly, by a wonderful coincidence, gives the message Bacon 33, but otherwise it must often be regarded as a "foil."

"Ignoto" is not to be based on reversible numbers in any Cipher Code, but in a direct manner on the A3 A3 Standard Rosicrucian Cipher Code, for it reveals 8.8, equal "ff," the double form for "ffrauncis" repeatedly shown, with the name, in Folio 1 of the Northumberland MSS.

Now "ffrauncis" equals 111, the 3 Shibboleth pillars or Tripod of the Geometric Code in question, which gives harmonious interpretations of "Master Sp.," "Puttenham," and other surnames mentioned by Mr. Cuninghame.

It is by the Sub-Shibboleth of the Standard Code U (You), 22, and I 11, that 33 is obtained. "Julius," for instance, gives exactly 99, the total numerical value at the starting message of the three Shibboleth boundary lines of the Standard Code, viewed as a Tetrahedron; the sequential messages in perfect numerical order being 43 and 53, also to be multiplied by three. To show how responsive this Code is to Baconian tests I may mention that B A. and CON(E) are practically equivalent as 4.3 and 43; and in evident agreement with certain Rosicrucian emblem-relics in a niche above the Porch at Gorhambury ruins.

Yours faithfully, HENRY WOOLLEN.

West Ealing, W., December 3rd, 1913.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In 1609 Lord Delaware, Sir Thomas Gates, and Sir George Somers were appointed Governors of Virginia, and proceeded thither to assume their duties. On the way Somers was wrecked on the Bermudas, then called "The Isle of Devils." His ship was called the *Sea Venture*.

This was the wreck that is said to have suggested the play known as (Shakespeare's?) *Tempest*. The author of the play had evidently read Strachey's "True Repertory," and followed it in his descriptions of the "vexed Bermoothes": the cries of the mariners, the trembling star, flaming among the shrouds, which had appeared to the excited imagination of the weary and fasting Admiral (Somers) at the helm.

Strachey's words are as follows:

"On this strand at moonlight, the hag-born Caliban might roll and growl: Sycorax, the blue-eyed witch, might hover in the cloud wracks; and the voices of the winds whisper strange secrets."

Now here is the interesting thing to note—"the same historian Strachey wrote another book, 'The Historie of Travail into Virginia Brittainia,' covering the years 1610, 1611, and 1612. Of this book he made two copies in his own handwriting, one of which, dedicated to Sir Francis Bacon, was deposited in the British Museum; the other, dedicated to Sir Allen Apsley, lieutenant of the Tower, and father of Lucy Hutchinson, was preserved among the Ashmolean manuscripts. There these two priceless manuscripts slept unnoticed more than 200 years! They were finally unearthed in 1849 by R. H. Major, of the British Museum, and printed for the Hakiuyt Society."

The foregoing is copied from Mrs. Roger A. Pryor's book, "The Birth of a Nation," Grosset & Dunlop, publishers, New York, copyrighted by the McMillan Company in 1907. Is it conceivable that Shakespeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, could have seen Strachey's "True Repertory" of Admiral Sir George Somers' wreck on the

"vexed Bermoothes," and is not it a moral certainty that Sir Francis Bacon *did*? He could not have helped seeing it, situated as he was at the centre of the Government which sent Somers out. Moreover, the certainty that he *did* see Strachey's report is strengthened by the proved fact that Strachey's *next* book was dedicated to Bacon himself.

That no one happened to discover the fact of the dedication until 1849 does not weaken the case of a Baconian deduction at all.

We may assume that Bacon wrote to Strachey after reading his *first* book, "The True Repertory," and that Strachey, very naturally, would have dedicated his *second* book to the great statesman who had taken an interest in the first production.

Yours truly,

P. H. W. ROSS.

New York.

---

## NOTES.

A CORRESPONDENT asks: "Can you tell me if 'speare' was pronounced as 'sper' (e) in the 16th century? I believe it would be. This would be very significant in view of the lines in *The Tempest* :—

'The strong based promontory  
Have I made shake and by the spurs plucked up  
The pine and cedar.'

A strong based promontory is a *Beacon*, is it not?"

---

"A Bacon Lover" asks: "Is it generally known that the garden of Lincoln's Inn Fields owed its laying-out to Francis Bacon? The Commission was entrusted to Lord Verulam, Lord Chancellor, with Earl Worcester, Earl Pembroke, Earl Arundel, and others, according to plans of Inigo Jones, Surveyor-General of King's Works."

---

Lord Bacon has been claimed by a contributor to the *Eastern Daily Press* as "a great East Anglian," who writes:—



"This great man, though London born, must have spent much of his early life at his father's Suffolk home at Redgrave. Being of a delicate constitution, one would naturally suppose his parents would be inclined to bring him down from town to the restfulness of Redgrave Hall whenever they could. One may imagine him as a boy walking and riding in the park, enjoying the freshness of the air and the freedom from restraint and developing in bodily vigour by exercise out of doors. . . . Thus it came about that a quiet country seat in East Anglia sheltered a Lord Keeper, a Lord Chancellor, viz., the two Bacons, father and son, and one who had the offer of the latter office but declined, Lord Chief Justice Holt; and lovers of this eastern part of England may be excused a little pardonable pride in recalling this fact at this time."

---

It would appear that Shakespeare had read the Maxims of Publius Syrus, and it would be interesting to know when they were first translated into English. The following are amongst the parallelisms to be found between the two writers:—

"Unless degree is preserved, the first place is safe for none."

—Maxim 1,042

"Take but degree away, untune that string  
And, hark what discord follows! Each thing meets  
In mere oppugnancy."—*Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii.

"When fortune flatters she does it to betray."—Maxim 278.

"When fortune means to men most good,  
She looks upon them with a threatening eye."

—*King John*, III. iv.

"It is better to learn late than never."—Maxim 864.

"An unlessoned girl, unschooled, unpractised;  
Happy in this, she is not yet so old  
But she may learn."—*Merchant of Venice*, III. ii.

"Familiarity breeds contempt."—Maxim 640.

"I hope upon familiarity will grow more contempt."

—*Merry Wives*, I. i.

---

There will appear in *The New Dramatic Mirror*, of

New York, in the issues of 1st and 8th of April, a series of questions put by Dr. Appleton Morgan on statements made and arguments advanced in "The Baconian Heresy," with Mr. J. M. Robertson's replies thereto.

---

A Bacon Society has been established in Sydney, N.S.W. Efforts are being made to form a similar Society in Chicago. During the last month enquiries have been received from Vienna as to the constitution and objects of the English Society, with a view to the establishment of a Society there.

---

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has during the past winter delivered a series of lectures with lantern slides, which have been attended by upwards of 5,000 people. These have been—October 18th at Fulham Town Hall; November 3rd at Lyndhurst Hall, Hampstead; November 17th at Ealing Victoria Hall; December 8th at the Public Hall, East Croydon; February 2nd at Wimbledon Baths; March 2nd at the Town Hall, Battersea; March 30th at King Edward's School, Finchley. On the 15th of April Sir Edwin will lecture at the Stanley Hall, Kentish Town.

---

Mr. W. T. Smedley addressed the members of the St. Albans and Herts Architectural and Archæological Society in the Museum, St. Albans, on November 10th on Francis Bacon, Canon G. H. P. Glossop presiding; Mr. H. Kendra Baker lectured at Saffron Walden in January on the Shakespeare Authorship, and Mr. R. L. Eagle addressed the Masters and Pupils of the Royal Masonic School at Watford on the 15th of March on the same subject.

---

Miss A. A. Leith draws attention to a passage in a letter dated December, 1577, written by John Sturm from his

school at Strasburg to Lord Burleigh. He writes: "A son of the Lord Keeper is with us, his good manners, modesty and conversation please me so much that I am sorry I cannot make use of him as his goodness deserves." Sturm adds: "He is named Edward." Edward Bacon, who was the youngest son of the Lord Keeper Bacon by his first wife, represented Yarmouth in the Parliaments summoned from 1576 to 1583. There is no evidence that Edward Bacon was abroad in 1577. Sturm's language does not appear to be such as he would use in speaking of a Member of Parliament, but it would be well suited to a youth of 16 or 17. Francis *was* abroad in 1577.

---

Messrs. Constable & Co. will publish in the course of the next two months a work by Mr. Edward George Harman, C.B., entitled, "Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon" (15/- net). The book is a critical examination of the poems of Edmund Spenser, as a result of which the writer concludes that the real author of these poems was Francis Bacon, and he claims to demonstrate that many of the books of the period, including the plays of Shakespeare, had the same origin, and that Bacon began authorship on the various impersonations as a boy. The book contains much new matter of great historical interest, emerging in the light of this theory, the most important being in the interpretations which the author gives of the principal characters in "The Faery Queen."

---

There are abundant signs that there is a quickening of interest in literary circles in France as to the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. Especially is this the case in Paris, where several enthusiastic supporters of the Baconian theory have been holding

*causeries*, at which the subject has been ventilated. Bacon's acknowledged works have probably attracted more attention in France than in any other country, if one may judge from the number of books which have been written there by way of criticism and appreciation.

---

The 353rd Anniversary of Bacon's birth was celebrated by the Members of the Society at the Trocadero on the evening of the 22nd of January, when Sir Edward Durning-Lawrence presided at a dinner which was largely attended. Mr. H. Kendra Baker proposed the toast of "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon." The Anniversary was also celebrated by the Members of the Lyceum Club on the preceding Monday, when Lady Boyle presided, and the speakers included Mr. Frederick Harrison.

JULY, 1914

# BACONIANA

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
William Shakspere of Stratford ... ..	133
Shakespeare and Asbies ... ..	143
The Boar-Initial ... ..	149
"The Felicities of Queen Elizabeth"	152
"The Master-Mistress" Identified ... ..	159
James Spedding ... ..	164
Did Bacon Write "Don Quixote"? ... ..	169
Jottings on Lord Bacon ... ..	171
Bacon and Virginia ... ..	177
Obituary ... ..	179
Review ... ..	191
Correspondence ... ..	194

LONDON

GAY &amp; HANCOCK, LIMITED

Cases for Baconiana  
can be had

# The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

---

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be:—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet; also his character, genius, and life; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakspeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

---

*The columns of BACONIANA are open for the expression of all shades of opinion on the subjects discussed therein, although such opinions may not be in accord with those held by the Council of the Society or the Editor of the Journal.*

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* JULY, 1914. No. 47.

---

## WILLIAM SHAKSPERE OF STRATFORD.

I N an article which appeared in the November number of *The Nineteenth Century Review* I did my best towards re-directing Baconian research into normal ways of investigating questions of literary authorship, and showed or attempted to show that certain utterances of Ben Jonson were oracular, in the sense that they were intended to be read two ways. The chief business of the present article is to exhibit the Shakspeare tradition as it appears to a Baconian. A business of inferior interest is to answer a dozen or so of colourable objections which appeared in the December number of *The Nineteenth Century* above the signature of Sir Edward Sullivan.

1. Sir Edward says it is a libel on Ben Jonson to represent him as taking part in a literary juggle with intent to uphold the secret of Bacon's authorship. Jonson's motives for undertaking the part were *ex hypothesi* perfectly pure. Where then is the libel? Posterity has no indefeasible unconditional right to know the true name of any author, great or small. Sir Walter Scott must have taken this view when he denied —so we learn from his Letters edited by Horace Hutchin-

son, 1904—without a blush, that he had any hand in the writing of the *Waverley Novels*. Scott told a lie. Jonson equivocated. Jonson's motives were loyalty to and sympathy with fallen greatness. Scott's motives, whatever they may have been, cannot have been altruistic. If Scott's lie were justifiable, as my opponent will probably allow, Jonson's equivocation was positively laudable.

2. Sir Edward scorns the notion that Bacon chose for his "*alter ego* in composition," an unlettered actor. The notion is a bogey of Sir Edward's own making, with a view possibly to rhetorical effect. The only *alter ego* my article suggested was Sir Tobie Mathews, and that suggestion had nothing to do with "composition." The particular service that we Baconians think Shakspeare may have rendered to Bacon would require scarcely any qualification beyond loyalty to employers, and this qualification he probably had, or the Burbages (for instance) would hardly have called him a "deserving" man, as they did in 1635.

3. My opponent believes he has found a "singular inconsistency" in my reluctance to subscribe towards the search for ciphers, mystic numbers, and so forth. I was a Baconian before cipher-hunting began, and have consistently held aloof from anything of the kind.

4. Sir Edward, in dealing with my attempt to harmonize the ambiguities of the Ode to Shakespeare, accuses me of "here and there docking a sentence of its ending, asking an unsuspecting reader to take its meaning from the mutilated fragments in which I am careful to present it," and so on. Before waxing indignant on the "unsuspecting reader's" behalf, he should have cast his eye over the last two pages of my article. There he would have found that I had anticipated his accusation by giving the Ode *in full*.



5. Sir Edward pronounces that "there is really no evidence of anything unusual in connection with the production" of the *Prince's Masque*. An eminent critic—I think Malone—speaks of its "unusual splendour," and as the heir to the throne was both its sponsor and the leader of its stately dances, there is good reason to believe that it really was an extremely magnificent entertainment. Sir Edward says that *Neptune's Triumph* was staged in a much more costly and gorgeous manner. This statement needs proof, the more so as I seem to remember having read that *Neptune's Triumph*, though prepared, was never performed at all. Sir Edward also says that the *Prince's Masque* is "one of the poorest of all" Jonson's works of the kind. This also is a hard saying, and some of us might like to know whether it is backed by any other *arbiter elegantiarum*.

6. Sir Edward's mention of the relation between Bacon and Jonson induces me to repeat opinions expressed in a forgotten *Essay* of mine, viz., that the relation in question had once been anything but cordial, and that the change on Jonson's part occurred somewhere between his return from Scotland and Bacon's 60th birthday, which Jonson celebrated in the well-known lines addressed to the Genius of York House, Bacon's then London residence :

"Hail, happy Genius of the ancient pile.  
How comes it all things so about thee smile?  
The fire, the wine, the men! and in the midst  
Thou stand'st as if some *mystery* thou didst,  
*Pardon*, I read it in thy face, the day  
For whose return, and many, all these pray;  
And so do I."

The italicised words are mine, and I still imagine them to refer, the one to Bacon's secret intimacy with Poetry, his resolve to withhold his name from "her family," the other ("pardon") to Jonson's unfriendly criticism of the Bacon of an earlier age.

7. Sir Edward says truly enough that the First Folio is carelessly printed, abounds in mistakes, etc. The conditions were probably very unfavourable to accuracy—many hands and no supreme co-ordinator. Jonson, though *ex hypothesi* the nominal editor-in-chief in virtue of his Ode and other prefatorial matter, would not be likely to bestow upon a mass of work which the true author was bent on disowning, a tithe of the care and attention that he had devoted to the 1616 edition of his own *Works*.

8. Sir Edward seems to think that the sparing use by Bacon of verbal forms obviously characteristic of Shakespeare is a very strong point in his favour. But as one of the elements of our theory is that Bacon desired to escape identification with Shakespeare, his avoidance of such forms needs no explanation at our hands.

9. My opponent, having asserted that "most readers of Bacon would, I should say, describe him now as the master of only one style," takes me to task for having said that Bacon was a "master of many literary styles." Dr. Abbott, perhaps the highest living authority on Bacon, says of him that he "wrote magnificent prose in almost every conceivable style." Osborn, in *Advice to a Son* (1673) says that he had heard Bacon "entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and hounds, and at another time out-cant a London chirurgeon." These quotations are enough to suggest that Bacon's style must have been Protean. As for Sir Edward's "most readers," I wonder how many, if any, genuine students of Bacon will be found in that crowd.

10. Another of Sir Edward's objections is founded on Bacon's acknowledged *Essay Of Love*. On the impossibility of reconciling that *Essay* with, for example, *Romeo and Juliet*, my opponent and I may agree. But

if that impossibility be conclusive against Bacon's authorship of the play, it is equally conclusive against his authorship of an unacknowledged Speech of his, *The Praise of Love*. Here are a few extracts from this Speech, an early manuscript of which, after having had a narrow escape from destruction by fire ages ago, was accidentally discovered some years after Spedding had published his fourteen volumes of *Lord Bacon's Works*. Love, we gather from this Speech, "is the happiest state of the minde; the noblest affection"; makes the "mynde heroicall"; is not a relative good, but "a true good . . . sweetneth the harshness of all deformities; . . . when two soules are joyned in one . . . no force can depress . . . being indeed, if not the hiest, yett the sweetest affection of all others. . . . Who denieth but the eye is first contented in love? . . . Lett us (therefore) make our suit to love that gathereth the beames of so many pleasures," etc. Reconciliation of this Speech with the *Essay Of Love*, as of the *Essay Of Love* with the Play of *Romeo and Juliet*, may well be impossible. Explanation, however, is ready to hand, and is the same for the Speech and Essay as for the Essay and Play. Both the Speech and the Play were written in youth and meant to delight, whilst the *Essay Of Love* was written in age, with an unromantic eye to business. One of the harshest sayings in the Essay, "The stage is more beholding to *Love* than the life of man," was probably written after Bacon had turned sixty, and some other very harsh sayings at the close of the Essay belong to about the same date (1625).

II. Sir Edward says that Prof. Dowden (whose deliberate opinions on Shakespeare should always be treated with respect) "summed up his views" on sceptics like myself in these words: "They have selected the one impossible man of the whole period as

the author." The words, we are told, were spoken in Sir Edward's presence. What is their value? To impartial judges they will suggest that Dowden, having caught sight of an effective paradox, must have fired it off without any reflection at all. Spedding held that Bacon had "the 'fine phrensy' of the poet," and thought "it would have carried him to a place among the great poets," had it not been his—Bacon's—life-long "study to refrain his imagination." A more accurate account of the matter would be that Bacon's "fine phrensy" was not refrained until long after it had carried him to a very high place among great poets. Shelley, it may be added, discerned that Bacon "was a poet."

In hands so unskilful as mine, this jerky, discontinuous method of controversy soon becomes irksome. Perhaps the following biographical sketch will prove less fatiguing.

Sixty years ago—before the days of Halliwell Phillipps and the New Shakspere Society—it must have been easy to accept the tradition that William Shakspere of Stratford was the supreme poet whom England is proud to claim as her son. Nowadays it is common knowledge that this William's home education was of the meagerest. School education of a sort he may have enjoyed, on the assumption—for which there is no evidence—that his ignorant parents thought it worth while to pay the school fees. It is extremely unlikely that clever boys abounded at Stratford, and any schoolmaster worth his salt would have kept his eye on a scholar of unusual promise, yet no schoolmaster has put on record any fact about the boy William. His schooling, if any, must have been cut very short, for a tradition, quite in keeping with all that we know of the lad, informs us that he was apprenticed to a butcher, an occupation which in those days probably required no schooling at all. The next credible tradition about him

is that he fell into bad company, and got mixed up in poaching raids. The story says nothing against his intelligence. But a butcher's boy who made so unprofitable use of his leisure was not likely to develop before 1593\* into a poet who, in his "idle hours," wrote *Venus and Adonis*, an elaborate poetical exercise, elegant, facile, rhetorical, suggesting an author brought up on the Classics and at the time of writing obviously under the spell of Ovid. In this connection it may be well to mention that a year or two before 1593 (when *Venus and Adonis* made its public appearance) another rhetorical exercise on the same theme was being written by Francis Bacon.

In the eighties of the sixteenth century Shakspeare left Stratford, possibly because the neighbourhood had become too hot for him. Arrived in London, his first job, so we are informed, was to hold the horses of well-to-do frequenters of a theatre. In the course of time he found his way into the inside of the building, and ultimately became an actor not "over-parted" by roles such as the Ghost in *Hamlet*. But of his goings and comings, his sayings and doings in London, we know so little that we might suppose him to have donned the helmet of invisibility. After twenty or twenty-five years residence there, he may be said to emerge into view, no longer poor it is true, but mentally the very same person as before—to judge from the way in which the remainder of his life seems to have been spent. A hundred and fifty years later Samuel Johnson said to Boswell: "Why, sir, you find no man at all *intellectual* who is willing to leave London. No, sir, when a man is tired of London, he is tired of life, for

\* There are not wanting students, anti-Baconian as well as Baconian, who hold that *Venus and Adonis* was written as early as 1585.

there is in London all that life can afford." Is it conceivable that a man who cared for literature or things of the mind would—except under medical imperative, of which there is no hint—have quitted the intellectual centre of England for the deadly dulness of the Stratford of that day, with its butchers and bakers and publicans, its Quineys, Harts, Walkers, Nashes, Greenes, and the rest? There is no evidence that the "Tribe of Ben," the frequenters of the Mermaid Tavern, or anyone else remonstrated, or made any effort to keep him by the banks of Thames. He seems indeed to have slipped out of London entirely unobserved, just as he had entered it a quarter of a century earlier. Again, when so many notable pens were lamenting the death of Prince Henry, or celebrating the marriage of his sister, what was Shakspeare doing? How came he to be silent? In 1613 he is investing money in London, and in 1614 is interesting himself in an enclosure scheme that was then agitating his native place. In the course of these and many similar transactions he must have had occasion again and again to communicate with lawyers at a distance, to say nothing of friends and relations; yet not one line of his handwriting has yet come to light. His signatures—those which pass for his—betray unfamiliarity with the use of a pen, and suggest indifference as to the spelling of his name.

That he ever cherished any ambition more exalted than that of buying land and passing for a squire; that it ever occurred to him to claim interest in, or power over, such a thing as a manuscript; that he would have been able to appreciate anything in the shape of a library; that he had acquired a liking for poetry or prose, history, philosophy, or science—on all these points we find abundance of conjecture, but a famine of trustworthy evidence. There is reason to

believe that his death was sudden, for his health was "perfect" at the beginning of 1616. His will, our most authentic and inward piece of evidence concerning the man, is rootedly commonplace. His precious plate (with the exception of a "brod silver and gilt bole" left to his daughter Judith) is bequeathed twice over, once to his niece Elizabeth Hall absolutely, and again to "my sonne in lawe John Hall gent, and my daughter Susanna," whom he made his executors. His "second best bed with the furniture" is not forgotten. New Place cannot have been entirely destitute of books, but whatever they were, both he and his lawyer forgot their existence, or lumped them together as so many negligible items of the owner's "goodes chattels and household stuffe." Of literary executors there is no suggestion. A legacy of 26s. 6d. was left to R. Burbage, and John Hemynges and Henry Cundell were to have like sums "to buy them ringes." But of Jonson, Chapman, or any literary name there is no mention. On the 23rd of April, 1616, the worthy man died. When Jonson died the world of letters went into mourning. When Shakspeare died the world of letters seems to have been absolutely unconscious of loss; for not a single note of regret that synchronises with his death has reached our attentive ears. If one cared to put a finishing touch to the story, his intimate London friends, the Burbages, would serve the turn. Some twenty years after his death, and about a dozen after the publication of the First Folio, these Burbages—among them Richard Burbage's widow—presented a humble petition to Philip Earl of Montgomery, survivor of the two Earls to whom the First Folio was dedicated, imploring him not to allow them "to bee trampled upon by new men." In their petition they mention Shakspeare twice, and though it was obviously their cue to praise him, the most they can find to say in his favour is that he was one of "those deserving men, Shakspeare,

Hemings, Condall, Philips and others." Had he been the author of the First Folio, it is incredible that these friends of his in addressing the Earl to whom the volume was dedicated, should have failed to mention the fact. Yet orthodoxy would have us believe that this man was Shakespeare! We are not blind to the difficulties of the Baconian view; indeed, some of us were agnostics before we became Baconians. What we contend is that our theory, unlike the Stratford legend, does not demand a faith which would be able to move mountains.

The historian of Laputa tells of a machine by means of which "the most ignorant person at a reasonable charge and with little bodily labour might write books in philosophy, poetry, laws . . . without the least assistance from genius or study." Is it possible that Swift when he wrote this was thinking of the Shakspere tradition?

EDWARD W. SMITHSON.



## SHAKESPEARE AND ASBIES.

IN a series of articles in the *Athenæum* Mrs. Stopes gives a pathetic account of the passing of the estate of Asbies from the Shakespeare family, and elaborates a theory that "the story of William Shakespeare's lost inheritance is the clue to the shaping of the poet's life." The substance of the articles is taken from the documents which are published in Mr. Halliwell Phillips' "Outlines of the Life of William Shakespeare"; and the writer, who has evidently been industrious in her researches, adds very little of her own apart from inferences which are unconvincing, and in some cases misleading, because she is not sufficiently familiar with the legal technicalities relating to the ancient methods of alienation of land and the old system of chancery proceedings.

There is one document, however, which the writer claims to have discovered, and this triumph of research has led her to write contemptuously of Baconians. It is a list of the names of the "Gentlemen and Freeholders of the County of Warwick" in the State Papers of April, 1580, "which," as Mrs. Stopes says, "none of the Baconians appear to have noted." It is certainly difficult to appreciate the significance of this document, which merely mentions John Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon as the owner of the estate of Asbies—a matter about which there has never been any controversy or doubt.

The facts relating to the alienation of Asbies by John Shakespeare, the father of Wm. Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, may be gathered from an impartial examination of the pleadings in the litigation which followed the mortgage of the property in 1578. Unfortunately Mrs. Stopes is not impartial, for she accepts the allegations of John Shakespeare, the plaintiff, and

entirely rejects the other side of the story. She imagines that John Shakespeare was very badly treated in the matter, whereas it is difficult to see how he had any case at all. He commenced several actions against John Lambert, one of which was based upon allegations of fraud and was not proceeded with; another was dismissed with costs by an order in Chancery; and the other was carried as far as taking the evidence of witnesses on commission and was then abandoned by the plaintiff.

The theory of Mrs. Stopes is that these results were possibly due to lack of funds, but a closer examination of the plaintiff's claims and the statements in the defence suggests that the litigation was vexatious and never ought to have been instituted.

The story to be gathered from the pleadings may be briefly told. In 1578 John Shakespeare was in financial difficulties, and to meet his growing liabilities he borrowed money from his wife's relations, giving as security a mortgage on lands which had come to him through his wife. Among other loans he borrowed £40 from his brother-in-law, Edmund Lambert, and gave as security a mortgage on the estate of Asbies. The mortgage deed was a sale of the property, subject to the condition that if the £40 was repaid by Michaelmas, 1580, the sale should be void. The money was not repaid within the stated period, and other formalities—by "deed poll and livery of seisin" and "levying a fine"—were completed by John Shakespeare establishing the title of Edmund Lambert as the owner of the property.

The process of "levying a fine" requires some explanation. An action was brought in the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster by a writ demanding the lands. The defendant in consideration of the purchase money, or admitting a former gift, acknowledged the plaintiff's right to the lands. Terms of compromise

were then drawn up and called "The Concord." The Court official drew up an abstract of the writ and concord, which was called the Note; and from the Note he made the Chirograph of the Fine. Indentures of the Chirograph were made and delivered to the parties, and these were the title deeds or evidence of ownership of the property.

Mrs. Stopes apparently does not realise that John Shakespeare adopted this process of "levying a fine" in respect of the estate of Asbies, and the Lamberts held the Chirograph or title deeds to the property which, on the death of Edmund Lambert in 1587, passed to his son and heir, John Lambert.

These formalities having been completed, it is somewhat surprising to find John Shakespeare, after a period of ten years, embarking upon litigation with respect to the estate of Asbies; and there seems to be some substance in the allegation of the defendant (John Lambert) that the complainants (John Shakespeare and his wife) "do now trouble and molest this defendant with unjust suits in law, thinking thereby, as it should seem, to wring from him some further recompense for the said premises than they had already received."

The litigation began in 1589, when John Shakespeare brought an action in the Court of Queen's Bench against John Lambert, alleging that the defendant had promised to pay him £20 more for the property of Asbies. He also made a charge of fraud and claimed the sum of £30 as damages. In his defence John Lambert denied the promise, and the action was not proceeded with.

It is interesting to quote Mrs. Stopes' article commenting on this action, where she says: "It is logically certain that, however it might be entered in his parents' names and his own, William Shakespeare, as the heir apparent, was a party to the action—probably instructed the attorneys and did all the personal duties of a com-

plainant. And thus, by a peculiar combination of circumstances, the first time William Shakespeare's name was written in London, the first time it was spoken in London, *was in the Law Courts!*"

The enthusiasm, which inspired Mrs. Stopes to italicise these words, is quite unaccountable when one realises that the case was abortive and never came into Court at all.

The next step in litigation is after another interval of nearly ten years; but, apart from the suggestion of a stale claim, it is a recognised practice of the Courts to regard with suspicion any claim against the estate of a deceased person. In 1597 John Shakespeare and his wife started Chancery proceedings against John Lambert to recover the estate of Asbies, alleging that the £40 which had been borrowed on mortgage in 1578 had been tendered to Edmund Lambert (then deceased) in 1580, but that the latter had refused it and demanded the payment of other debts due to him from John Shakespeare before he would re-convey the mortgaged property. This was denied by the defendant; and on the face of it the allegation does not seem credible, having regard to the lapse of seventeen years between the Chancery suit and the time when the tender was alleged to have been made. But, apart from these considerations, there is the fact that the plaintiff carried the case as far as the examination of the witnesses on commission and then abandoned the claim.

Mrs. Stopes tells us that she has diligently sought for the depositions of the witnesses, but without success; and then apparently from want of familiarity with the old system of procedure in Chancery she makes this curious statement:—

"That they (the depositions) had been taken, *and had been in favour of the Shakespeare's*, may be inferred from the entry :

'John Shakespeare and his wife:—If the defendant shew no cause for stay of publication by this day sennight then publication is granted' (23rd Oct., Mich., 41 and 42 Eliz. D. and O., and B. 1599)."

The practice in Chancery was for witnesses to be examined before Commissioners, and when their evidence had been taken the depositions were sealed up until the date fixed for "publication." After publication no witnesses could be examined and the pleadings were closed, unless a special order was obtained. "Publication" meant unsealing the depositions and giving copies of them to the parties, and the entry quoted by Mrs. Stopes was the usual order, which allowed an interval of a week in case the defendant wished to apply to postpone publication. There is nothing in the entry to suggest that the evidence was in favour of the Shakespeares.

The other "indiscretion," as it is called by Mrs. Stopes, committed by John Shakespeare, was a Chancery suit in his own name alone. The proceedings were based upon the same allegation and brought for the same purpose as the other suit for the recovery of Asbies, in which both he and his wife were complainants. Whether this multiplicity of actions was intended to harass the defendant, or whether it was a mistake of the complainants' lawyer, as Mrs. Stopes fondly suggests, it is clear that after the plaintiff had taken out several commissions to examine witnesses and had not examined any, it was referred to a Chancery master and was dismissed with costs.

Such is the story of Asbies as shown by the documentary evidence, and, apart from the romance of poverty, there is little cause for sympathy with John Shakespeare in his lost estate. There is certainly no ground for attacking John Lambert, who, according to the statement of John Shakespeare and his wife, was

"a man of great wealth and ability and well friended and allied amongst gentlemen and freeholders of the county of Warwick." In the same pleading the parents of William Shakespeare described themselves in 1598 as "of small wealth and very few friends and alliance in the said county," which ought to be of special interest to the author of "Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries." In one of her articles in the *Athenæum* Mrs. Stopes even suggests that William Shakespeare was descended from the Beauchamps, and that "Asbies was to the family (Shakespeare) the cherished heirloom, the visible link of connection between their branch and the historic family (Beauchamp) from which they sprang." She does not mention, however, anything more substantial than the belief that a Beauchamp was godmother to an Arden.

Mrs. Stopes is more convincing when she states that "it is perfectly certain that Asbies was intended to be the inheritance of William Shakespeare and that he was prepared to be a small farmer, for which reason he was not trained to any profession or apprenticed to any trade (all 'traditions' on this question are untrustworthy)."

HAROLD HARDY.

## THE BOAR-INITIAL.

**M**ANY signs of the assistance and superintendence of Francis Bacon in the production of the innumerable books on various branches of knowledge published during his reign over it have been already pointed out by members of our Society. Let me add another which, even if already noticed, deserves, I think, more particular attention. On page 41 of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence's illuminating work "Bacon is Shakespeare" will be seen a plate representing "Bacon's crest from the binding of a presentation copy of the 'Novum Organum,' 1620." This crest is a boar passant, erminois, tusked, and charged with a crescent as a label on the left shoulder. He is moving from right to left. The sign I am about to deal with, although bearing some resemblance, differs in several details. Readers who turn the pages of what may well be described as the instructive volumes which issued from the English Press about Bacon's time will find in many of them prefaces and chapters beginning with a capital letter T, behind the stem of which is a boar trippant, argent, tusked, without a label, and moving from left to right. Now, I suggest that almost anyone acquainted with the acknowledged works and style of Bacon would, on reading the matter following this boar-initial, have reason to suspect that he was either the author or instigator of the preface or chapter thus begun, or that it had some relation to him or his works. So far as my limited research has gone I have found this boar-initial only in volumes printed by Adam Islip, and the literary owners of "eyes more devoutly willing to be blind" will at once catch at this admission and attempt to explain away the significance of the use of this initial by saying that it chanced to be amongst the ornamented type of the printer, who used it haphazard.

Possibly; but the curious fact will remain that he seemed to have no other initial bearing an animal ornament in his founts. Moreover, he certainly had other kinds of initial T's at hand, as appears from the pages of the books to which I will now refer. An article in the *Times* of 3rd December, 1913, on the date of *Hamlet*, gave an account of Gabriel Harvey's copy of the "Chaucer," edited by Speght, and first published in 1598. I have no access to that edition, but have examined the second, which was printed by Adam Islip in 1602. It contains an address to the editor by Francis Beaumont. Speght was of Peterhouse College, Cambridge. Francis Beaumont, the father of the dramatic poet, was also of Peterhouse. He was made a judge of the Common Pleas in 1593. In his address to Speght he writes of those ancient learned men of their time in Cambridge, whose diligence in reading the works of Chaucer themselves and "commending them to others of the younger sort did first bring you and me in love with him: and one of them at that time, and all his life after, was (as you know) one of the rarest men for learning in the whole world." Who was this "one of the younger sort" unnamed by Beaumont? Francis Bacon was at Cambridge in 1573. Now let us turn to the prefatory Life of Chaucer in the volume. The initial letter is a capital T, crossed by a boar trippant. Read the Life, and say whether or not it is in the style of Bacon. Be it his or another's, it is admirable. The same initial and boar is prefixed to other pieces in the same volume, *inter alia* to "Troilus and Cressida," which poem may have suggested to "Shakespeare" his play of that title.

In the "General Historie of the Netherlands," by Edward Grimston, a thick folio issued from the same Press, the boar-initial, appears at pages 12, 16, 33, most notably, however, at page 910, where it is followed by a



particular and disparaging account, extending to some 153 pages, of the proceedings of "Robert Dudley, Earle of Leicester, Governor for Elizabeth, Queene of England." We know Bacon's opinion of him. In "The Estates, Empires, and Principalities of the World," translated out of French by Edw. Grimstone, Sargeant-at-Arms, a folio, also printed by Adam Islip for Mathewe Lownes and John Bill, 1615, the boar-initial begins a chapter on "The Commonweale of Venice," and another on "The Estate of the Sophi of Persia." In "The Living Librarie," translated by John Molle from Latin, also printed by Adam Islip, 1621, the boar-initial will be found at chapters 9, 12, 22 of Book III., and chapter 4 and 11 of Book IV. In "The Herbal," by Gerard, printed by Adam Islip, Joice Norton, and Richard Whitakers, 1633, an orderly and exhaustive account of former writers on the subject from the earliest times is in a preface beginning with a boar-initial. This preface is indeed signed Thomas Johnson, the editor of the "Herbal," but whether such a learned treatise on classic authors was really written by him may well be doubted. He was an apothecary in London, and cultivated a physic garden on Snow Hill.

It would be interesting to examine the rest of the books from the same Press for the boar-initial, but I am not in a position to do so. One volume I have from which it is absent, viz., "Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses," translated from the French by Arthur Golding and printed by Adam Islip, 1595. It is a quarto, and contains ornamented initials of various sizes. There are at least three capital T's, but they are of a larger size than the boar-initial, and of different pattern, and are without the figure of the animal. I must candidly add that I expected to find it there, for the volume is a collection of excellent essays,

the result of deep learning, research, and thought. The inference may be either that Bacon had nothing to do with it, or that the printer did not have the boar-initial cut so early as 1595; or, lastly, that my suspicions as to its significance are ill-founded.

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

---

### "THE FELICITIES . OF QUEEN ELIZABETH."

THERE is considerable obscurity anent this Latin pamphlet, and the circumstances of its publication. Bacon is reputed to have left a Will. Mr. Spedding gives *in extenso* a copy entered upon the register of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, dated 19th December, 1625. The original Will was delivered out on 30th July, 1627, and is missing. In this copy Will no reference is made to the Elogium forming the title to this article.

According to an extant MS. copy in the hand of one John Locker, an earlier Will was made by Bacon on 10th April, 1621, at the period of his great stress, when his fate was being determined upon by the House of Lords. In this Will, if its accuracy may be relied on, he directed that his body should be buried obscurely (a practice then common to members of the Rosicrucian fraternity), and as to his unpublished compositions, he gave certain directions, and "in particular I wish the Elogium I wrote, 'In felicem memoriam Reginæ Elizabethæ,' may be published." We are in doubt as to the correctness of the registered version of the later Will, as Archbishop Tenison published a transcript out of the Lord Bacon's last Will containing different words. For comparison I place the three Wills or versions in juxtaposition:—

"My compositions unpublished, or the fragments of them, I require my servant Harris to deliver to my brother Constable, to the end that if any of these be fit in his judgment to be published he may accordingly dispose of them. And in particular I wish the Elogium I wrote, 'In felicem memoriam Reginæ Elizabethæ,' may be published."—Locker MS. of Will of 1621.

"But towards that durable part of the memory which consisted in my writings I require my servant Henry Percy to deliver to my brother Constable all my manuscript compositions and the fragments also of such as are not finished; to the end that if any of them be fit to be published he may accordingly dispose of them. And herein I desire him to take the advice of Mr. Selden and Mr. Herbert of the Inner Temple and to publish or suppress what should be thought fit. In particular I wish the elegy which I writ, 'In felicem memoriam Elizabethæ,' may be published."—Tenison Transcript of last Will, 1625.

"Also I desire my executors, especially my brother Constable, and also Mr. Bosville presently after my decease to take into their hands all my papers whatsoever which are either in cabinets, boxes or presses and them to seal up until they may at their leisure peruse them."—Registered Will, 1625.

There is variation between the three Wills as to another important phrase.

1. "I bequeath 'my name to the next ages and to foreign nations.'"—Locker MS. of Will of 1621.

2. "For my name and memory I leave it to foreign nations and to mine own countrymen after some time be passed over."—Tenison Transcript of last Will, 1625.

3. "For my name and memory I leave it to men's charitable speeches and to foreign nations and to the next ages."—Registered Will, 1625.

The solution of the problem may be that Bacon left one Will for probate purposes and another for certain private directions which are not yet apparent.

If it be the fact that in 1621, and again later, he particularly wished the Elogium to be published, it will be useful to discuss why his directions were given.

The Queen died on 24th March, 1603. The Elogium appears to have been written in the summer of 1608. About this time Bacon sent a copy of it to Sir George Carew, then ambassador in Paris, with the explanation that it was written by way of reply to a recent book attacking the Queen's memory. The Elogium was written in Latin, and was read by John Chamberlain, who by letter to Dudley Carleton, of 16th December, 1608, recommended him to try to get it. In February following Bacon sent a copy of it to Sir Tobie Mathew, who appears to have suggested in reply that it rather opened the subject to contradiction.

Bacon, in writing again, told his friend that he had heard from the Embassy at Paris and from some others that it carried a manifest impression of truth with it, and was having a convincing effect.

In 1608, therefore, the pamphlet had gone the round of Bacon's friends, but whether printed or not is uncertain. Why did Bacon in 1621, and if the Tenison Manuscript refer to a last Will (which I believe it does), again in 1625 wish the Elogium in particular to be published after his death? We can understand his writing it; he himself gives an explanation. Apart from this he held the strong view that "*Bona Fama propria possessio defunctorum*" ("Advancement of Learning").

Yet there are inconsistent circumstances to be noted. If Bacon was, in 1608, strongly anxious to perpetuate the good fame of Elizabeth why did he in the "*De Augustis*" of 1623 repeat passages of his "Advancement

of Learning" *with the portions in praise of Elizabeth expressly omitted?* For these passages, see Bacon's "Works," Montague, Vol. III.

According to Chamberlain the Latin of the Elogium was not very clever. Mr. Spedding says: "It cannot have been for its literary merit that Bacon especially valued this writing; for the style is more than usually hasty and careless." He further remarks that Bacon seems to have gone purposely out of his way to bring in the passage alluding to the death of Anne Boleyn. He concludes that he was only making occasion to place on record Anne's last message and his own opinion of her innocence.

The translations of the Elogium made by Mr. Montague and Mr. Spedding respectively differ widely in language but not in general expression.

It will be convenient to here inquire whether the statements in it as to Elizabeth bear the stamp of truth, as Bacon understood it. "No man can be secret except he give himself a little scope of dissimulation" (Essays). "Childless she was, and left no issue." "She desired only a short inscription on her tomb, recording her name, her virginity, and the time of her reign. She allowed herself to be wooed and courted, and even to have love made to her, and liked it, and continued this longer than was decent for her years." There is something to admire in these very things whichever way you take them. *If viewed indulgently* they amount to generous admiration only.

Having regard to the object for which the Elogium was written in 1608, namely, to repel scandalous statements, Bacon does not appear to have moved much further from the real truth than a modern speech for the defence in an unwisely opposed divorce action.

Certain disbelievers in the truth of the biliteral cipher story base their attitude broadly upon the general

unlikelyhood that a man at the solemn time of making his Will would not be entirely truthful. Further, that the man who deliberately wrote the statements in the Elogium directed to be published after his death could not have written the contradictory expressions of the biliteral cipher and word cipher concerning Elizabeth. I admit that his Will of 1625 alluded to Lady Anne Bacon as his mother and Sir Nicholas as his father. Were these statements and those of the Elogium so untrue that Bacon is to be bound by them? I ask, Could he have stated anything else? To the world he was Francis Bacon. Sir Nicholas and his wife were his father and mother until he knew to the contrary at the age of 16. They treated him as their son, and the affection of the foster mother was ever (so the biliteral cipher shows) more certain and true than that of the real mother. It is not uncommon for this state of the affections to arise from long association with foster parents even when known to be such. The Queen desired to be considered a virgin, said the Elogium. So far, then, as the State and her own fame were concerned these statements were not unreasonable to have been put forth at that date.

To her faults it was best for the State and her fame that outsiders should be a little blinded.

But why all this anxiety for the publication of the Elogium?

I think the answer is two-fold. In April, 1621, in the midst of all Bacon's literary preparations, the crash came—a bolt from the blue. Busied with his literary and public activities, with most of his literary aims unfulfilled, his ciphers not made decipherable, his secret history incomplete, and his life probably forfeit, he made his Will and composed his last prayers to the Almighty. "He prepared," to use the biliteral cipher words, "to die and make no sign." The "De

Augmentis" of 1623, with its key to the cipher, was, in 1621, unpublished, perhaps only partly written. He evidently resolved to drop all attempt to make the world acquainted with his true history. The publication of the Elogium was the surrender of his cherished ideals and the return of good for evil to the mother who had sacrificed his claims to her own ends. In April, 1621, Bacon met his troubles half way. Things, however, turned out to this nervous old man better than he had ever expected.

His imprisonment was nominal. The fine, which would have beggared him, was, in September, assigned from the Crown to trustees for his benefit. Being a debt from the Crown it had first claim on his estate, and stood in the way of and protected him from the enforcement of his large liabilities to other creditors. He had his pension of £1,200 a year, and was restored to favour if not to office and the Court.

He again set to work, and completed his writings and ciphers.

By the year 1625 entirely different reasons for publication of the Elogium arose. One may be that it contained passages which by the word cipher had been connected with the mosaic drama of "Anne Boleyn." The play is outlined in the biliteral story as follows:—

"In the storie of my most unfortunate grandmother, the sweet ladie who saw not the 'headman's' axe when she went forth proudly to her coronation, you shall read of a sadness that touches me nee're, partlie because of neerensse of blood, *partlie from a firm believe and trust in her innocencie.*

"Therefore every act and scene of the play of which I speake is a tender sacrifice and an incense to her sweet memorie.

"It is a plea to the generations to come for a just judgement upon her life, whilst also giving the world

158 "The Felicities of Queen Elizabeth."

one of the noblest o' my plays hidden in cipher in many other works."

I accordingly suggest, as a reasonable explanation, that the 1625 document of directions, which Tenison speaks of as a transcript from Bacon's last Will and Testament, was intended to insure the publication of the Elogium, not for its Latin or its literary merits, and not even for its references to Elizabeth, otherwise similar encomiums would not have been omitted from the "De Augustis," but mainly because it was a document in which Bacon lodged important word cipher material, in which (in the view of Mr. Spedding) he went purposely out of his way to place on record Anne's last message and his own opinion of her innocence. This material was put into English by Rawley many years before 1657.

As for Elizabeth, the words of the Elogium which conclude the essay are significant:—

"The only true commender of this lady is time."

PARKER WOODWARD.



“THE MASTER-MISTRESS”  
IDENTIFIED.

**N**O sonnet could be more esoteric than number 20, which has consequently been the subject of much controversy, and many theories as to its interpretation. The lines read:—

“A woman's face, with Nature's own hand painted,  
Hast thou, the Master-Mistress of my passion ;  
A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted  
With shifting change, as is false women's fashion ;  
An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,  
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth ;  
A man in hew, all hews in his controlling,  
Which steals men's eyes, and women's souls amazeth.”<sup>o</sup>

Who is this “Master-Mistress” of the poet's passion? Malone observed, “It is impossible to read this fulsome panegyric, addressed to a male object, without an equal mixture of disgust and indignation.” Let us see, however, whether the enigma may be interpreted in such a way as to free Shakespeare from reproach. Suppose, for instance, the lines be allegorical? The meaning of “a man in *hew*, all *hews* in his controlling” has always been inexplicable, and has been altered to appear in

\* The remaining lines (9—14) of this Sonnet, I interpret thus:—  
“And for a woman [*a piece of tender air*’—*Poesy*; “*my thought . . . slight air*,” *Sonnet 45*] wert thou first created [*gifted by God*]  
Till Nature [*natural philosophy*], as she wrought thee, fell a  
doting,  
And by addition [*of the pursuit of philosophy*] me of thee [*Poesy*]  
defeated.  
By adding one thing [*the name of Philosopher*] to my purpose  
nothing: [*which I would rather ignore*]  
But since she [*Nature*] pricked thee [*Bacon*] out for women's  
pleasure [*for Poesy's delight*]  
Mine be thy love [*let me pursue that*], and thy love's use their  
treasure [*and my achievements shall surpass all*].

modern additions as "a man in *huc*, all *hues* in his controlling," but this change does not seem to help us over the difficulty, and is quite unwarranted, as we shall see.

The clue as to "Master-Mistress" is to be found in Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients" (1609) under the fable of "Dionysus" or (*Passion*), who "when grown up appeared with so effeminate a face that his sex seemed somewhat doubtful." Bacon interprets this as meaning that "every vehement *passion* appears of a *doubtful sex*, as having the strength of a man at first, but, at last, the impotence of a woman." This is a very quaint notion, but, I believe, of great antiquity, for Apollo (the god of Poetry and Eloquence, and, therefore, *Passion*) was always represented as a tall, beardless youth with long hair. He had, moreover, the power of assuming various shapes (or "*hews*") to gratify his passion in his amours. He thus answers the description of the "Master-Mistress" of this Sonnet, but the complete portrait, and explanation of the Sonnet, is forthcoming from that delightful example of parabolical poetry, "A Lover's Complaint," which was included with the Sonnets in the quarto (1609). In the Poem we find a shepherdess, an effeminate-looking, "maiden-tongued," passionate and eloquent youth, a hill, a river, and a horse. Considered as an allegorical poem, it is impossible not to identify

The Shepherdess	as <i>the Poet</i>
The beautiful Youth	as <i>Apollo</i>
The Hill	as <i>Helicon</i> .
The River	as <i>Hippocrene</i> .
The Horse	as <i>Pegasus</i> .

In the opening stanza, the shepherdess is discovered sitting by a river and,

"Of folded schedules had she many a one,  
Which she perused, sighed, tore, and gave the flood."

Is "folded schedules" a cryptic allusion to enigmatical writings, which she was "drowning," as Prospero intended to do with his "book"?

The description of herself agrees in a very remarkable manner with that of the writer of the sonnets.

She begins her "complaint":—

" Though in me you behold  
The injury of many a blasting hour,  
Let it not tell your judgment I am old ;  
*Not age, but sorrow, over me hath power.*"

Compare this sentiment with that expressed in Sonnet 19:—

" Yet, do thy worst, old Time : despite thy wrong,  
My love shall, in my verse, ever live young."

Bacon is described by a contemporary as "of a middling stature ; *His countenance was indented with age before he was old.*" Shakespeare represents himself (Sonnet 62) as "Beated and chopp'd with tann'd antiquity" ; see also Sonnet 73, &c.

She fulfils the qualification of *Passion* as "having the strength of a man at first, but at last the impotence of a woman," for against the youth's "subduing tongue" she long held her "city," but yielded to his "art of craft" eventually.

" Ah me ! I fell, and yet do question make  
What I should do again for such a sake."

Apollo, being banished from heaven by Jupiter, served nine years as a shepherd at Thessaly ; hence the favourite adoption of a pastoral setting for allegorical poetry. The youth is indeed the god of poetry and eloquence ; there is nothing of the rustic about him :—

" So on the tip of his subduing tongue  
All kinds of arguments and question deep  
All replication prompt, and reason strong,  
For his advantage, still did wake and sleep :

To make the weeper laugh, the laugher weep,  
 He had the dialect and different skill,  
 Catching all passions in his craft of will.  
 That he did in the general bosom reign  
 Of young and old ; *and sexes both enchanted.*"

Which again reminds us of the Sonnet :—

"Which steals men's eyes, and women's souls amazeth."

All "hews" were, moreover, in his "controlling" :—

"O, that *infected* [*i.e.*, feigned] moisture of his eye  
 O, that *false* fire which in his cheeks so glow'd,  
 O, that *forc'd* thunder from his heart did fly,  
 O, that sad breath his spungy lungs bestow'd,  
 O, all that *borrow'd motion*, seeming ow'd ! [*i.e.*, his own]."

Shakespeare claims this power for the poet :—

"The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,  
 Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,  
 And, as imagination bodies forth  
 The *forms* of things unknown, the poet's pen  
 Turns them to *shapes*, and gives to airy nothing  
 A local habitation and a name."

—*Midsummer Night's Dream.*

Mr. E. G. Harman, C.B., in "Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon," points out on page 99 that "Spenser" in "The Masque of Cupid" ("Faerie Queene," III. xii. 7) places "Fansy" at the head of the procession of figures :—

"The first was Fansy, like a lovely Boy  
 Of rare aspect, and beautie without peare,"

and remarks, "The 'grave personage,' who appears before the entry of the Masque, is evidently the poet's idea of himself, outside and *in control of the shapes* which stream from his imaginative faculty."

Another important observation by Mr. Harman concerning "Spenser," which is also a characteristic of the author of "Shake-speare's Sonnets," appears on page 58 of his book :—

“By a division of personality—which is very marked—he includes himself among his pupils, confessing and admonishing himself freely under the guise of character and dialogue. Similarly he treats his genius as something apart from himself, and refers to its performance in language of superlative eulogy.”

Shakespeare does precisely the same in the Sonnets, and because he cannot “with manners” praise that which is part of himself, he in Sonnet 39, makes a separation of his genius:—

“O, how thy worth with manners may I sing,  
 When thou art all the better part of me? °  
 What can mine own praise to mine own self bring?  
 And what is't but mine own when I praise thee?  
 Even for this let us divided live,  
 And our dear love lose name of single one,  
 That by this separation I may give  
 That due to thee, which thou deserv'st alone.”

There only appears to be a single reference in the index to the Sonnets in Mr. Harman's book. It is unfortunate that their allegorical significance has been overlooked, for the Sonnets clinch many of his arguments.

In the Fable of *Orpheus* (Wisdom of the Ancients) we are told that “In sorrow and revenge for his death, the river Helicon (*i.e.*, Hippocrene), sacred to the Muses, hid its waters underground, and rose again in other places.” Bacon's explanation is that “barbarous times succeeding, the river Helicon dips underground: that letters are buried till things having undergone their due course of changes, learning rises again, and shows its head, though seldom in the same place, but in some other nation.”

° Bacon writes in a similar strain, “How many things are there which a man cannot with any face or comeliness say or do himself? A man can scarce allege his own merits with modesty, much less extol them” (Essay “Of Friendship”).

This undoubtedly explains the action of the Shepherdess "tearing of papers" which she gives to "the flood."  
R. L. E.

---

### JAMES SPEDDING.

**T**HIS famous editor of the works of Francis Bacon is repeatedly quoted as a Solon whose decision ought to be final on the question whether Francis wrote the Shakespeare plays. His considered opinion appears to have taken the form of a letter to the Hon. N. W. Holmes in 1867, in which he said:—

"I believe that the author of the plays published in 1623 was a man called William Shakespeare. It was believed by those who had the best means of knowing, and I know nothing which should lead me to doubt it. . . . I doubt whether there are five lines together to be found in Bacon which could be mistaken for Shakespeare, or five lines in Shakespeare which could be mistaken for Bacon, by one who was familiar with the several styles and practised in such observation."

It will be seen that he first rested his decision upon the *authority* of those who had the best means of knowing. The only persons answering this description are Heminge, Condell and Ben Jonson. The testimony of the two former has long since been shown to be untrustworthy.

Jonson's position as an "authority" is irretrievably damaged by his allegation in the Folio that "My Shakespeare," and in his "Discoveries," that Francis Bacon had accomplished in the English tongue that which might be preferred to anything produced by insolent Greece or haughty Rome. Outside miracle, the only tenable inference from Jonson is that Francis Bacon and "My Shakespeare" were *one and the same person*.

Mr. Spedding's other ground of decision was dissimilarity of style, yet he had edited documents and books in which Bacon's style had varied greatly, and in one of which Bacon wrote, "Style is as the subject matter," and in another mentioned poesy as a *style* of writing he was then using.

Passages from Bacon and "Shakespeare" conforming to Mr. Spedding's conditions have been produced by the score, and passages of identity of thought and expression by the hundred. The writings of Mr. Reed, Mr. Wigston, Mrs. Pott, Mr. R. M. Theobald, and many other writers, witness to this.

Mr. Spedding first took in hand the editing of Bacon's philosophical, ethical and educational works, and consequently *steeped his mind with the style of Bacon in his old age when writing serious literature*. This was a fatal education for free judgment upon the point of style.

Mr. Spedding did not attempt to write Bacon's biography, but only accompanied the sorting out of Bacon's letters and smaller papers with a commentary biographical and historical, his *avowed object* being to exemplify through the Bacon documents the *politics and scientific progress of the age* in which Bacon lived. Nor had he the proper qualifications for a biographer. Mr. G. S. Venables, in a preface to "Evenings with a Reviewer," affirmed that in Spedding's intellect and temperament there was no versatility, that his literary predilections were limited to a few authors, and his knowledge of the details of history extended in neither direction beyond the time of Elizabeth and James I.

Moreover, Spedding himself was in the habit of saying that he got undeserved credit for knowledge because no one would believe that such a man was so profoundly ignorant.

Thus steeped in the style employed by Bacon in his

old age in the composition of his philosophical and serious treatises, Spedding next set about ordering all the letters and smaller tractates which had been permitted to survive three hundred years from Bacon's birth. He started with the assumption that Francis was the younger son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne Bacon, and notwithstanding inconsistency after inconsistency staring him in the face, plodded along with his task without as much as a query. He passed Rawley's remark—that Francis came back from France with a message for the Queen—as something that might or might not have occurred, and noticed the Hilliard miniature without seeing from the date upon it that Francis must have returned awhile in that year (1578), and that to have had his portrait painted by the Queen's private Court limner was a curious circumstance.

The sturdy objection raised by this young man to being put to the study of law is recorded without illuminating comment. Nor did the letter showing that the Queen had provided a maintenance for this penniless "son of the Lord Keeper," and had appropriated him to her service, disturb the placid serenity of Spedding's mind. He recorded the Prime Minister's several interventions in the affairs of Gray's Inn in order to obtain for Francis special conditions of board and residence without asking why this particular youth was so favoured. He missed the fact of the young man's second travel abroad, and never seems to have come across the remarkable letter to Francis while abroad from Sir Thomas Bodley. He set out F. B.'s "Notes on the State of Christendom," but does not wonder why this penniless youth was employed on such work, nor why he should have had the impertinence at the age of 24 to write a special letter of advice to the Queen. Spedding did not know that Francis was the elder son of the Queen, born under



conditions which rendered open recognition politically impossible. Nor did he appreciate that Francis, with a fine eye to the situation, elected at the age of 31 to pursue a literary career and take all knowledge for his province, trusting that his chance of the throne might eventually prove fruitful. The incidents of 1593 conveyed no hint to Mr. Spedding's mind. He agreed with the political wisdom of F. B.'s conduct over the subsidy vote and admired the bold and dignified way in which Francis maintained to the Queen the correctness of his conduct in the matter. But yet Spedding expressed no surprise that this youth (if of Nicholas Bacon parentage) was not clapped into gaol for his impudence. Nor was he surprised that this youth, without legal experience, should have badgered everybody, including the Queen herself, to let him have one of the most important and remunerative law offices in the gift of the Crown. It did not strike Mr. Spedding as strange that this youth (whom he believed to be son of Sir Nicholas) should show temper at not getting what he wanted, and should threaten to retire to Cambridge or go and live abroad.

Mr. Spedding—good, easy man—believed that during the period 1580—1594 Francis was steadily devoted to the study and practice of the law; yet all the time the letters showed that except three appearances in Court in the early part of 1594, and for which cases for private suitors he had to obtain special permission from the Queen, his legal practice was confined to the Queen's business only, and that after the law offices had been filled he announced his determination *not to follow the law*, as it took up time he could devote to better purposes. But that if the Queen really needed his services at any particular time, of course he would be ready to give them.

It never occurred to Spedding to ascertain, if he could, what were these better purposes, so he could not understand the allusion to the "waters of Par-

nassus" in F. B.'s letter to Essex, or to "concealed poets" in F. B.'s letter to Sir John Davis in 1603. Mr. Spedding cited numerous entries from the "Promus," but only wondered for what purpose they were written. He could read the quotation, "Magnitudo Honeris et Oneris," in Bacon's letter to Burleigh, and, although he thought he knew his "Shakespeare," did not recall the play upon the two words in Wolsey's speech—

" Out of pity taken. A load would sink a navy,  
Too much *Honour*. Oh 'tis a *burden!*"

No man recognised more fully than Spedding the nobility of character and intellectual qualities of this great poet, philosopher and prince. No one has fought so bravely and devotedly in his defence. The fine Sonnet which Spedding wrote to Bacon's memory deserves to be better known. It is given in *BACONIANA*, 1905, and its concluding lines are:—

" But when I thought how humbly thou didst walk  
On earth—how kiss the merciless rod, I said,  
Surely 'twas thy prevailing voice that prayed  
For patience with these men, and this rash talk,  
Because they knew thy deeds but not thy heart,  
And who knows partly can but judge in part."

It is nevertheless time to demonstrate that Spedding was no adept on questions of authorship. The pomp and pageantry of the age of Elizabeth, with its burst of drama and song in the midst of which Francis moved, and to which he largely contributed, was never properly present to Spedding's mental vision. "He saw but in a glass darkly."

Had Mr. Spedding studied the subject in the light of the wealth of new information now at our disposal, his earlier short views, so frequently quoted to obstruct and delay, would have been readily and entirely withdrawn.

PARKER WOODWARD.

## DID BACON WRITE "DON QUIXOTE"?

IN a letter appearing in the *Referee* combating criticisms which had been made in the public Press on some of the opinions held by the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. John Hutchinson makes the following observations on the suggestion which emanated from Sir Edwin that Francis Bacon was the author of "Don Quixote." The suggestion, Mr. Hutchinson says, "does really seem startling, and one of those things calculated, in the words of the late lamented Mr. Kruger, to 'stagger humanity.'" He goes on to say:—

"But is it, indeed, a self-evident delusion? Frankly, on first hearing of the statement bluntly put like that, I, for one, was inclined to think that my worthy fellow-Baconian was over-leaping the bounds of probability. But I did not, as some ever-vigilant never-thinkers did, give vent to my credulity in loud 'Go-to-Bedlams!' the usual formulæ of dissent on the part of the orthodox; for the apparent 'lunatic' actually gave reasons for the strange faith that was in him, and gave them calmly, and I sat down to study them, and though I will not go so far even yet as to say that I am convinced by them, yet I must admit that they seemed and seem really sound and solid reasons for a 'lunatic' (as a 'Baconian' is, of course).

"I found that what Sir Edwin said in defence of his seemingly strange assertion was this, namely, that Francis Bacon, the great searcher after truth and the foremost champion of it historically, as against romance, wrote this most diverting of satires in *English*, which in its Spanish dress (donned in honour of Spain, as the home of such literature) completely laughed the latter out of existence in the character it had assumed. Was there anything unreasonable, not to say impossible, in all this when you came seriously to think of it, especially when you were informed that the 'dresser-up' of the satire in its Spanish dress was the greatest of literary artist in Spain, Miguel de Cervantes-Saavadra, who, being at the time in trouble and financial difficulties and 'out of a job,' as the saying is, gladly undertook the task, no doubt, for a suitable consideration? Is

there anything, I ask again, so ridiculous in all this as to arouse the roars of laughter with which it was received by those who think that there are really no things in heaven or earth that are not included in their philosophy, especially when the Spanish dresser-up of the satirical figure of the 'Don' distinctly tells us that he is but the 'dresser-up' and not the creator of the said figure, or, to use the exact phraseology of the preface to the Spanish edition of the work, 'the stepfather, not the real father'—meaning the translator, not the author—of the said treatise?

"Then, again, how is it that, when the work became to be known in English, this same declaration was attached to it, or at least to the edition known as Shelton's translation? And why is this 'translation' pronounced to be the best ever issued? Who was Shelton that he should so far surpass all the other translators? History only records of him that he was employed by the Earl of Suffolk (a friend of Bacon) specially to 'do'—that is, if Sir Edwin be right, to 'father'—this work. Beyond this, it does not appear that he ever did anything else. But Sir Edwin tells us, or told us, that Shelton's 'translation' was 'the best,' because it was really the original—the English original—from which the Spanish book, published in Madrid seven years before, was translated by Cervantes, and that there are proofs of this in the volume itself which he himself possessed.

"Now, sir, I appeal to you whether this story of the origin of a great book, however strange—however, at first hearing, incredible—does not hang together, and whether it is not worthy of being examined with critical care and study, instead of being received with thoughtless jeers and laughter? I am one of those who venture to think so, and, without committing myself finally to this or any other speculation of the late 'arch-Baconian,' as he has been called, I am of opinion that it would be better, before sneering or jeering at the conclusions of an evidently sincere man, in the first place to examine them, and then, if need be, refute them. That, however, as far as I know, has never yet been attempted."

## JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

*(Continued.)*THOMAS MEAUTYS, SECRETARY TO SIR FRANCIS  
BACON.

**A**LL research work in connection with Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban, gives Baconians great pleasure, and this has been true as regards the studies necessary to find out the real facts in the history of Thomas Meautys, who acted as secretary to our great philosopher, and who was knighted by Charles I. in 1641. For the last two years steady work has been going on, and the reward is some knowledge as to his doings, his pleasure, and his work, and the finding of letters from Thomas Meautys to various personages, which reveal his warm, generous nature, and also show that he was a man who occupied several very important posts and performed his duties in a manner so satisfactory to his patrons that he attained high position, which he retained to the end.

The results of this research will be embodied in a history called "Life and Letters of Thomas Meautys, Secretary to Sir Francis Bacon." Pending publication, it will be in type manuscript at the command of the Bacon Society. It is important that the life of this man who was so intimate with Bacon should see light, as so many errors have arisen, by reason of the fact that he had a second cousin, also a Thomas Meautys, who was knighted by James I. at Whitehall in 1610. The history of this older man, who is so often confounded with the secretary, is merely that of a soldier who spent many years in the Low Countries and endured privation and poverty in connection with his profession. The cousins remained dear friends always, as is to be seen by their letters. In a misleading article appearing in *BACONIANA* for April, 1914, on page 111 it is stated: "But the letter

was not written by Mr. Thomas Meautys, who had been Bacon's private secretary ; it came from that gentleman's cousin of the same name, who had close upon the date of Bacon's last will, 19th December, 1625, lent Bacon £300, and, as a creditor who was interested in preserving what could be saved of Bacon's estate, had a claim to early information. He was subsequently made a joint administrator."

My research shows this statement to be incorrect, for Bacon does not seem to have had any dealings at any time with Sir Thomas Meautys the soldier in the Low Countries, or with his sister, Lady Jane Cornwallis, who married Sir Nathaniel Bacon, a nephew of Sir Francis Bacon.

On the other hand, Thomas Meautys the secretary looked upon Lady Jane Cornwallis as his very dearest and most intimate lady friend and cousin, and he carried on a constant correspondence with her. In many of his letters he mentions her brother, whom he generally calls "Sir Thomas Meautys," as was the custom of the ceremonious days he lived in.

In an article—"Jottings on Lord Bacon"—in the January (1914) number of *BACONIANA* I set out the letter alluded to by Mr. Parker Woodward. The circumstances connected with it show that the letter was written by Bacon's secretary, and not by the secretary's second cousin, Sir Thomas Meautys.

This latter gentleman, brother to Lady Jane Cornwallis, writes constantly to his sister and tells her his hopes and fears, his work, and the trials which overtook him when in command of his troops while stationed in the Low Countries. He married a daughter of Sir Richard Burnebye, of Warwickshire, and there are letters from this lady extant to her "Deare sister the Lady Bacon at Culford" from "Yr. most affectionate and truly loving sister to be commanded Anna Meautys." When this marriage was about to take

place, the bridegroom found his finances were at low ebb, as he writes, "In regard of my long stay out of the Low Countries, monye is grown short with me at present." He asks his sister Lady Jane for "a helping hand to sett us up," and mentions in the same letter that his sister, Lady Sussex, has promised him £200 a year. This, then, was the man whom Mr. Parker Woodward says lent Bacon £300. A little more research ought to show the fallacy of this statement.

We have no information as to who was by the side of Bacon when he died at Arundel House. Most likely the secretary would be sent for from London, where his duties at Court kept him. What interests us at present is the mention he makes of Lord St. Alban's death in the only letter found up to the present in which he speaks of that death.

It is addressed to Lady Jane Cornwallis in Suffolk in answer to one in which she apparently had been correcting the style in which her cousin Meautys had been addressing her. She is no friend to Lord Bacon, it can plainly be seen, and her rigid ideas must have received a shock on hearing of the great Chancellor's fall from power. We are led to conclude this is the case from the silence Thomas Meautys preserves about Bacon in his numerous letters to Lady Jane. Unfortunately, we have *no letters from Lady Jane* to give us light on the subject.

In this letter Thomas Meautys mentions that Sir Thomas Meautys, *the brother* of Lady Jane, sailed for the Low Countries on the previous day, leaving his wife in the care of his sister, Lady Sussex, and he adds these words in the postscript, "My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried."

Here is the letter which was written in the month of Bacon's death:—

"MY EVER BEST LADY AND COUSIN,—I am right gladde that I have found out at last, which I understood by yours received, the way and style to make my letters acceptable, which is, I perceave, by being short and making profession of my desire and happiness to contribute anything towards your health and welfare, which I doe as cordially effect now, as then and ever doe the same while I am

T. MEAUTYS.

"Your brother went for the Low Countries yesterday in hope to retourne some six weekes hence. His lady remaynes with my Lady Sussex. My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried."

The original is in the collections of MS. at Brome and Culford in Suffolk. On the same page 111 of the incorrect article before referred to, it is stated that the ex-secretary and Lady Jane were brother and sister, "the latter marrying for her second husband Nathaniel, son of Sir Nathaniel Becon, and the former marrying later on than 1626 for his second wife Anne, daughter of Sir Nathaniel. Brother and sister, therefore, *both married children of Sir Nathaniel Bacon.*"

In this last sentence confusion is worse confounded. The brother and sister did *not marry* children of Sir Nathaniel Bacon. Lady Jane commenced life as Miss Jane Meautys, daughter of Hercules Meautys and Philippe Cooke; the latter, a daughter of Sir Richard Cooke of Gedeia Hall, and therefore a grand-daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, the Preceptor of King Edward the VIth. She married for her first husband Sir William Cornwallis, and on being left a widow with one son, whose christian name was Frederick, made a second alliance with Nathaniel Bacon, youngest son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, of Redgrave, Suffolk, who was the eldest son of Sir Francis Bacon's father, the Lord Keeper Bacon.



Through the influence of Secretary Meautys Nathaniel Bacon was made a Knight of the Bath at the Coronation of Charles I., and his wife from that day relinquished her former husband's name and became Lady Jane Bacon.

Her brother, Sir Thomas Meautys, married in 1625 a daughter of Sir Richard Burneleye, of Warwickshire, as before mentioned, and lived with his regiment chiefly in the Low Countries both before and after his marriage.

There is no mention of Bacon's Secretary ever being in the Low Countries. There is a letter where he says his cousin, Sir Thomas Meautys, has asked him to be godfather to his son and be present at the christening, but he fears he will be kept in this country by business connected with the late Lord Bacon's affairs. It appears that Lord Bacon left the estate of Gorhambury, as well as Verulam House in the same park, for the use of Thomas Meautys, his kinsman, and it must have been a serious question how to keep the property in good repair, as it was encumbered with such heavy debts and charges. Later on he lived in the mansion and kept it up. His life was always a busy one, for besides his duties as Clerk of the Privy Council, and Clerk of the Writs and Processes of the Star Chamber, he was elected a member of Parliament for the Borough of Cambridge on January 10th, 1621, and was re-elected to successive Parliaments on 12th April, 1625, in 1626, 1628, and 1640. Hard work did not frighten him, so he put himself forward as a candidate for a still more arduous post, as we learn on consulting the Domestic Papers of Charles I. in the Record Office. It will be noticed that he is always alluded to as "*Clerk of the Privy Council*," which at once distinguishes him from his cousin the soldier in the Low Countries, who had been "Sir" Thomas Meautys since 1610, whereas the Clerk of the Council only became a Knight in 1641.

The following extracts are from a document in the Record Office :—

“On March 16th 1635 Suggested grant to Thomas Meautys one of the Clerks of Council of the office of Muster Master General of England, as the said office was formerly granted to Sir William Wade, Lieutenant of the Tower of London deceased.”

And further on—

“Grant to Thomas Meautys of the office of Muster Master General of England, as Will Trumbull deceased lately held the same office, March 26th, 1635.”

It is to be supposed that Thomas Meautys had now a settled income and found himself in a position to persuade the young lady of his heart to marry him. His affections seem to have been entirely settled on the daughter of his beloved friend, cousin and patroness. Lady Jane Bacon, named Ann, whose father, Sir Nathaniel Bacon, was a nephew of Lord Bacon, Viscount St. Alban.

An alliance in 1637 with this young heiress enabled Meautys to live at Gorhambury, and do other things upon which he had set his heart—the most important being the erection of a suitable monument in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, to the memory of the great Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans.

The sculptor's name of this famous sitting statue has been lost, but the Latin inscription gives the name of the donor, Thomas Meautys. The following translation is by Chauncey :—

Francis Bacon  
Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban  
or by more conspicuous titles  
of Sciences of Light, of Eloquence the Law  
Sat Thus  
Who after all Natural Wisdom

and Secrets of Civil Life he had unfolded  
 Natures Law fulfilled  
 Let Compounds be dissolved  
 In the year of our Lord M.DC.XXVI  
 of his age LXVI  
 of such a Man  
 that to the memory might remain  
 Thomas Meautys  
 Living his Attendant  
 Dead his Admirer  
 Placed this Monument.

A. C. BUNTEN.

---

## BACON AND VIRGINIA.

In the following work—

“THE HISTORIE OF TRAVAILE INTO VIRGINIA  
 BRITANNIA”;

expressing the Cosmographie and Comodities of the  
 Country, together with the Manners and  
 Customes of the People,  
 Gathered and observed as well by those who  
 went first thither as collected by  
 WILLIAM STRACHEY, GENT.,  
 The First Secretary of the Colony.

Now first edited from the original Manuscript in the  
 British Museum by R. H. MAJOR, Esq., of the  
 British Museum.

[London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society,  
 MDCCCXLIX.]

—we found this *Introduction*, which says:—

“The Editor was extremely desirous of commencing

this introduction with a short biographical notice of William Strachey, the author of the following pages; but notwithstanding that he has used his best exertions, he has been unsuccessful in discovering anything more respecting him than such few points as connect him immediately with the subject of the work itself. The place and date of his birth, as well as those of his death, are unknown. That he was a person of importance in Virginia we shall hereafter show."

But what is of deeper importance to us than his being an unknown quantity is that his *Dedication* is

"To the Right Honourable SIR FRANCIS BACON, Knight, Baron of Verulam, Lord High Chancellor of England, and of His Majesties most honorable Privy Counsell."

Here we have a distinct *proof* of "*Bacon's*" connection with Virginia and its plantations from the beginning:—

"MOST WORTHELY HONOR'D LORD,

Your Lordship ever approving yourself a most noble fautor of the Virginian Plantation, being from the beginning (with other lords and earles) of the principal counsell applyed to propogate and guide yt; and my poore self (bound to your observance, by being one of the Graies-Inn Society) having bene there three yeares thither, imploied in place of secretarie so long there present; and setting downe with all my welmeaning abilities a true narration or historie of the countrie: to whome shoulde I submitt so aptly, and with so much dutye, the most humble present thereof, as to your most worthie and best-judging Lordship? who in all vertuous and religious endeavours have ever bene, as a supream encourager, so an inimitable patterne and perfecter: nor shall my plaine and rude composition any thought discourage my attempt, since howsoever I should feare to appeare therein before so matchles a maister in that

facultie (if any opinionate worth of mine own worke presented me) yet as the great Composer of all things made all good with his owne goodnes, and in our only will to his imitation takes us into his act, so be his goodnes your good Lordship's in this acceptation: for which with all my poore service I shall abide ever

Your best Lordship's most humbly,

WILLIAM STRACHEY."

Strachey informs us *To Bacco* was known in Virginia by the natives as *apooke* (p. 121).

ALICIA A. LEITH.

## Obituary.

### SIR EDWIN DURNING-LAWRENCE.

No sadder duty can be imposed upon anyone who has been actively associated with the work of the Bacon Society than the penning of an obituary notice of that generous spirit, who for many years past has occupied the position of their President.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence was the last surviving son of the late Mr. William Lawrence, a native of Cornwall, who came to seek his fortune in London in the early part of the last century. Mr. Lawrence was a man of keen judgment and foresight, possessing the necessary courage and resolution to give effect to those important characteristics. He established an important business as builder and contractor, and eventually amassed a considerable fortune, which enabled his sons to take rank amongst the largest holders of real estate in the City of London. He took a warm interest in municipal affairs, and occupied the position of an alderman of the City. Of his five sons, the eldest, Sir William Lawrence, attained the position of Lord Mayor, and afterwards represented the City of London in Parliament. The second son, Sir James Clarke Lawrence, also filled the office of Lord Mayor, and for many years was M.P. for the Borough of Lambeth. The third and fourth sons, Mr. Frederick and Mr. Alfred Lawrence, died whilst comparatively young. The son of the latter, Mr. F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, is now the sole surviving male representative of the family.

The youngest of the five brothers is the subject of this memoir. He had the advantage of a college education, and took his B.A. and LL.B. with honours at the University of London. In 1867 he was admitted as a barrister of the Inner Temple, but the ample fortune which he had inherited enabled him to follow his inclination for a political career. He unsuccessfully contested East Berkshire in 1885, Haggerston in 1886, and Burnley in 1892. It was not until 1895 that he entered Parliament, representing Truro as a Liberal Unionist, which seat he retained until 1906.

In 1874 he married Edith Jane, younger daughter of Mr. John Benjamin Smith, who was successively M.P. for Stirling and for Stockport, and was the first Chairman of the Anti-corn Law League.

Sir Edwin was created a baronet in 1898, when by Royal license he assumed the additional name of Durning, the maiden surname of Lady Durning-Lawrence's mother. His public services were manifold. He sat on the bench as a magistrate for Berkshire. For a short time he served on the Metropolitan Board of Works. He took a warm interest in University College School, where he was educated; also in the management of the Royal Waterloo Hospital, and many other public institutions.

The Lawrence family were attached to the Unitarian faith. Sir Edwin was a trustee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and was closely connected with the various institutions of the denomination, to which he rendered large financial support.

Sir Edwin was a man of exceptional versatility, and was the fortunate possessor of a phenomenal memory. He had, in a measure, taken all knowledge to be his province. It was difficult to name a subject with the history and particulars of which he was not familiar. This gave a great interest to his conversation. He would frequently astonish his hearers by recounting the circumstances of some out-of-the-way scientific investigation or historical incident with a wealth of detail which was remarkable. He was no mean artist, and many of his friends have carried away landscape sketches which he made whilst talking to them. Music, the drama, literature, science, yielded him sources of pleasure, and on these, and many other subjects, instruction could be gathered from his remarks. His earlier publications were "A History of Lighting, from the Earliest Times," and "The Progress of a Century; or, the Age of Iron and Steam."

Few men were more fearless in the expression of their opinions

than was he. Having formed an opinion, he urged it with a vigour which was sometimes resented. Half-heartedness he abhorred. Not only were his public benefactions on a princely scale, but in private life his liberality was unstinted. No cause or case of a deserving character failed to open the strings of his purse. When he recognised the need for support, he did not wait to be solicited. "How much do you want?" he would say.

An incident exemplifying this is related. He once overheard a schoolmaster refer to the difficulty some parents had in paying the school fees, and to some children who ought to be at his particular school, but could not be entered because their parents were too poor. Sir Edwin handed the master a check for £40, saying, "Use that as you like, and when you want more come to me." No man ever realised to a greater extent the blessedness of giving.

But there was one subject which in his later years overshadowed all others. More than twenty years ago he was led to an investigation of the controversy which was raging as to the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. His clearness of perception soon placed him amongst those who were attacking the claims put forth on behalf of the Stratford Shagspere. He recognised the importance of the controversy, and the obligation which fell upon all fair-minded men to help forward the establishment of the truth. His interest in the subject was originally created by the perusal of the first volume of "The Great Cryptogram," by Ignatius Donnelly. As his investigation proceeded he realised that only by the aid of the original editions of the works to be consulted could satisfactory progress be made. This led to the purchase of these books, and gradually his love for them increased. The idea of a complete collection of the literature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period resulted. And so came about the formation of the library at 13, Carlton House Terrace, which may be truthfully described as unique. Sir Edwin was one of the founders, and a member of the first Committee of the Lambeth Free Libraries, an office which he retained until his death. The head librarian, Mr. Frank J. Burgoyne, had an exceptional acquaintance with the printed books of all periods, and Sir Edwin inspired him with special interest in this literature and obtained his assistance in the purchasing of books. Whenever a duplicate could be obtained of a volume secured for his collection, Sir Edwin gave orders for it

to be purchased and presented it to the Lambeth Reference Library. These gifts were on such a scale that a collection has there been formed of Baconian books which is probably more extensive than is to be found in any other public library.

The collecting of these books has been conducted with consummate judgment. The library includes a copy of the First Folio of the Shakespeare plays, 1623, and those of 1632, 1664, and 1685, of the second edition, 1598, of Bacon's Essays, a splendid copy of Bacon's translation of the psalms, containing an autograph appreciation of Bacon in Latin verse by George Herbert, and other excessively rare volumes too numerous to be enumerated. The collection is priceless in value. It can never be dispersed. Its eventual destination is not settled. The books will eventually be placed in a public library. Sir Edwin was never more in his element than when showing his books to visitors, who came from all ends of the world. He would hand down volume after volume, and point out the wonders of page 53, and of the left-handed dummy prefixed to the Folio; tell the story of the peculiar circumstances under which some of the rarest books and engravings came into his possession. Hour after hour he would pour out information, appealing now and again to Mr. Burgoyne for some date or fact which for the moment had escaped his memory.

In 1910, "Bacon is Shakespeare" (profusely illustrated) was published. In this Sir Edwin gathered together the arguments and evidence which he considered irrefutably established the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. He presented a copy of the work to every public library in the world. The total circulation exceeds 30,000 copies. This was followed by an illustrated pamphlet of 24 pages, entitled "The Shakespeare Myth." In it the main arguments contained in "Bacon is Shakespeare" are reproduced. Upwards of a million copies of this pamphlet have been printed and issued. But this does not represent the whole of its circulation. It was translated and published in German, and Sir Edwin placed at the disposal of American newspapers the right of re-publication, and supplied blocks for the purpose, so that the total circulation of the subject-matter far exceeds that number. A propagandist effort on such a scale had never before been made. The attention of the public has been directed to the controversy by Sir Edwin's efforts to an extent which has resulted in his obtaining thousands of converts.



These productions brought him a correspondence with enquiries from all parts of the world. All letters received were courteously replied to. There was a time when it was difficult for a Baconian to obtain a hearing in the public press. The late President of the Bacon Society altered this state of affairs. He wrote letter after letter to the papers, and replied to the comments they provoked. During the last two years it is no exaggeration to say that several hundred letters from his pen have been published in the newspapers of this country, and elsewhere.

A note appeared in the last issue of *BACONIANA* reporting the series of lectures which Sir Edwin had delivered during the winter months of 1913—1914. He was an entertaining lecturer. He availed himself of a large number of lantern-slides to make plain his points and enforce his arguments. Less than a week before his death he was delivering his lecture on "Bacon is Shakespeare" to a large audience at Kentish Town. He was concluding with a brilliant rhapsody—

"Bacon! thou world's wonder!  
Deare Sonne of Memorie, great Heire of Fame,  
What needst Thou such dull witnessse of thy Name."

At this stage he fainted and fell backwards. Restoratives were administered, and he recovered. On the following Saturday he was well enough to take a walk on Hampstead Heath. He returned home, and shortly retired to bed, from which he never rose, but peacefully passed away in the early hours of the following Tuesday, the 21st day of April, in his 78th year. The interment took place on the following Saturday in the family vault at Kensal Green Cemetery in the presence of representatives from the many public institutions with which he was associated.

To the last his ardent interest in what may be termed his life's work was maintained, and cards had been issued inviting the members of the Bacon Society to attend at his house on the 7th of May to listen to a lecture from him.

The article from his pen which appeared in the April number of *BACONIANA* on "The First Folio" was one of his last contributions to the controversy. As an example of Sir Edwin's thoroughness in everything he undertook, it may be stated that in returning on the 25th of March, the proof of this article corrected, he wrote:—"It was exceedingly well printed, but we *must* make every comma, &c., exactly like our references." On

the 30th he wrote again, pointing out a further slight alteration (the substitution of "the" for "a") which he remembered had escaped correction.

The world is the poorer by the loss of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence. Public charities lose one of their most generous supporters. It has been said of him, that he never made an enemy and never lost a friend. The Baconian cause will suffer from the absence of one of its most convinced, energetic, and stalwart adherents, who has for years past, in season and out of season, propagated the truths as to the immortal fame of Francis Bacon. There is none upon whom his mantle can fall. It behoves those of his comrades who are left to brace themselves to continue the conflict with that fearlessness, that disregard of ridicule, scorn, or censure, which were the characteristics of their late President. They may always be encouraged by the certain knowledge that they hold the truth on this great literary problem, and that in the end truth must prevail.

---

THE Society has also lost two of its other members who were intimately associated with the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence in his Baconian labours.

Mr. Frank J. Burgoyne succumbed to an illness of long standing on the 18th of October last at the age of 56. In the previous year he underwent the critical operation of trepanning. This was for the time successful, and he returned to his duties, but the old trouble re-asserted itself with fatal results.

Mr. Burgoyne commenced training as a librarian at the age of 17 under Mr. Mullins at the Birmingham Reference Library. Subsequently he was sub-librarian at Newcastle-on-Tyne. From there he was appointed librarian at Darlington, and in 1887 he received the position of chief librarian at Lambeth, which position he held to the time of his death. He was a vice-president of the Library Association and a regular contributor to its "Transactions." He was also the author of "Library Construction, Architecture, &c.;" joint author of "Books for Village Libraries"; editor of "History of Queen Elizabeth, Amy Robsart, and the Earl of Leicester." He was the transcriber and editor of a very fine facsimile and type transcript of the famous Northumberland Manuscript.

Mr. Burgoyne possessed a thorough knowledge of books, especi-

ally those of the Elizabethan period, in which he probably had no superior, and his services were enlisted by the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence in the collection of his library. His advice was sought and freely given to his brother librarians throughout the country on important questions.

Mr. Burgoyne was a convinced Baconian and was a member of the Council of the Society.

MISS SHAWCROSS, who passed away after a very short illness in July last, was an old member of the Society, and had acted as private secretary to Sir Edwin and Lady Durning-Lawrence for many years. She was well known to her fellow-members and held in high regard by them.

---

DR. R. M. THEOBALD.

By the death of Dr. R. M. Theobald the Bacon Society loses one of its founders—one of its most enthusiastic and most accomplished members.

The Society was formed at a meeting held at 81, Cornwall Gardens, on the 18th of December, 1885. At this meeting, Dr. Theobald read a paper on "Bacon, as Viewed by his Biographers." He was a member of the first Committee elected. Only two of those who were present on that occasion now survive—Mrs. Pott, and her brother, Mr. Francis Fearon. In the following June, the first number of "The Journal of the Bacon Society" was published, Dr. Theobald acting as Editor. The Journal was published at intervals until 1892, when in the May of that year the title was changed to *BACONIANA*, under which title it still continues as a quarterly magazine.

Robert Masters Theobald was born in Birmingham on the 28th of November, 1829. At that time his father held a position of trust in a paper warehouse, but in 1833 became connected with the Religious Tract Society, and moved to London. His mother came from the Morell family, who were originally French—refugees from persecution when the Huguenot massacres occurred. At eight years of age young Robert was sent to the City of London School, where he remained about a year. In 1839 he was moved to the boarding school of his uncle, the Rev. Thomas Morell, at Danbury, in Essex. After a stay there of about four years he again became a pupil of the City of London School, of

which Dr. Mortimer was headmaster. In 1846 he competed for a scholarship at the Glasgow University. It was arranged that before proceeding to take up his studies there, he should spend a year at University College, London. He there studied Greek under Professor Henry Malden, and Latin under Professor de Morgan. After passing through a three years' course at Glasgow University, and taking his degree as M.A., he returned to London, and for a short time, theology and the ministry being considered his vocation, he attended lectures at New College, St. John's Wood, for the training of students for the dissenting ministry. There his orthodoxy was impeached, and he was civilly requested to withdraw or accept the alternative of expulsion. He chose the latter, and in 1852 published a pamphlet relating to the "removal" of himself and two fellow students. After this, he commenced studies as a medical student at University College. He there obtained the degree of M.R.C.S. In 1858 he married, and commenced as a general practitioner at Kentish Town. After a year he removed to Cambridge, staying about the same time, then to Kings Lynn, eventually settling at Blackheath. At one time Dr. Theobald acted as physician to St. Saviour's Hospital, Osnaburgh Street, Regent's Park, which was especially devoted to the practice of the Mattei System. His last years were spent at Lee, and it was there, in his 85th year, that he passed away in his sleep. He had been up during the day, and in the afternoon played chess. Retiring to bed about 10 o'clock he fell into a sleep from which he never awoke.

The story of Dr. Theobald's conversion to the Baconian Theory is set out in the first chapter of "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light." One day he was visiting a friend, and took up Gerald Massey's book on Shakespeare's Sonnets. Up to this time the idea that William Shakspeare, of Stratford, wrote the plays and poems attributed to him was, to Dr. Theobald, not so much a persuasion as a settled tradition. He asked his friend what his opinion was of Gerald Massey's book. The reply was: "Doubtless the book is good enough in its way, but if you want to get a clear light as to the genesis of Shakespeare's poetry, you should read *this*," and he put into his hands Nathaniel Holmes' book on "The Authorship of Shakespeare." Dr. Theobald thus describes the effect of its perusal upon his mind:—"As soon as the book was in my hand, the persuasion took hold of my mind that this question of the authorship of Shakespeare was one open to

debate, and that Holmes' conclusion was probably right. My conversion was of the most orthodox and instantaneous character, and the belief then adopted has never been disturbed. But although the central truth came suddenly, the reasons and arguments to support it could not thus immediately enter into the mind. That moment was the starting-point of a long course of study. I read all I could get hold of by Bacon, and re-read Shakespeare, and kept the two in perpetual juxtaposition for years, until the persuasion, which came by a flash of perception, ripened into a strong and well-grounded conviction, resting on facts and arguments solid and secure as mathematical demonstration."

At Kentish Town Dr. Theobald became acquainted with William and Mary Howitt, famous as poets and journalists. These were staunch Baconians. Their eldest daughter became the wife of Alaric Alfred Watts, the first Vice-President of the Bacon Society, from whom Dr. Theobald obtained his first knowledge, before referred to, of the Baconian hypothesis.

With an industry and devotion which were most praiseworthy the convert applied himself to an investigation of this fascinating problem. He had the advantage of classical attainments, which were by no means meagre. His pen was that of a ready writer. For nearly half-a-century his great gifts were lavishly used in searching for the truth, and propounding what he believed to be truth. The pages of *BACONIANA* and its predecessor contain numbers of articles written by him. They are clear, scholarly, and convincing. He was a regular contributor to the Press, as an article writer, reviewer, and correspondent. When Mrs. Pott published "Bacon's Promus," an exceptionally able review of the work from his pen appeared in *The Nonconformist*. As a controversialist he was in his element, always prepared to give and take hard blows. In 1888, before the appearance of Ignatius Donnelly's "The Great Cryptogram," proof sheets were supplied to *The Daily Telegraph*, which gave rise to a very stormy controversy in that journal, in which he took an active part. Subsequently, by the Editor of that paper's permission, a selection of the letters was edited by Dr. Theobald, and published in book form, under the title of "*Dethroning Shakespere*." When in England, Mr. Donnelly visited him, and stayed for some days at his house. Dr. Theobald's opinion of "The Great Cryptogram" was that the first volume was a very able and convincing state-

ment of the Baconian case as a matter of literary criticism. As to the second volume, dealing with the Cryptogram, he hesitated to speak, as his personal opinion of the author made him think he was as honest as he was gifted, but he affirmed he could find nothing in it but a gigantic imposture. It was either an apocalypse or a fraud. He held similar views as to the works of Dr. Ward Owen and Mrs. Gallup. His most famous encounters were with Judge Willis and Mr. Churton Collins, to and from each of whom he meted out and received heavy punishment.

Dr. Theobald wrote many pamphlets upon the subject, but his most important work was "*Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light.*" It is a volume in which the fulness of his knowledge of the Shakespeare plays and sonnets and of Bacon's works is made manifest. Notwithstanding the criticisms of Judge Willis in "*The Baconian Mint Examined,*" Mr. Crawford in "*Collectanea,*" and Mr. J. M. Robertson in "*The Baconian Heresy,*" it remains a masterly examination of the marvellous poetry and prose which, under different names, were written by one man. Some time ago he handed to the writer of this notice an interleaved copy of "*Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light,*" with copious manuscript additions and notes, with a request that if a second edition were called for he would see it through the press.

Dr. Theobald kept up correspondence with nearly every Baconian of note at home and abroad, and many eminent Shakespearean scholars. Especially cordial were his relations with the late Professor Dowden, whom he always insisted on describing as at heart a Baconian. In 1912 he published "*Passages from the Autobiography of a Shakespeare Student.*" In it he relates, in a gossiping manner, his connection with the notable characters, and their name was legion, with whom he came in contact during his long and eventful life, and expresses his opinions on many subjects outside his favourite study.

Until the last few years of his life music was one of his chief relaxations. He had a good knowledge of its theory, and was familiar with all the great masterpieces. On the piano he was a capable performer. In his declining years solving chess problems became his favourite amusement. He always retained his interest in theological works and had a complete collection of Dr. James Martineau's works. One or other of Martineau's works was constantly in his hand.

But in the fulness of years, surrounded and cared for by his

loving wife and family, honoured by a wide circle of friends attached to him by ties of affection, he has passed away. He was a man of keen intellect and sound judgment, industrious and painstaking in all he undertook. He was amiable in character, and generous almost to a fault. His memory will always be held in high regard by those who had the privilege of his friendship or of his acquaintance.

---

(FROM GERMANY).

IT was a cruel blow when on 21st and 23rd of April last two of the foremost champions of Shakespeare-lore, *Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence* and *R. M. Theobald, M.A.*, were removed from the battlefield.

The latter, "a hero of the true seed of honour," has become, by his ardour, the foundation-stone of Shakespeare-Society. This great enterprise was, as everybody knows, inaugurated at No. 21, Cornwall-Gardens, on the 18th of December, 1885, when Theobald, then in full manhood, being 55 years of age, delivered the first remarkable speech on "Bacon as Viewed by his Biographers." Up to his last contribution, "Adam Cupid," in *BACONIANA*, 1913, he ever remained one of the most active "Baconians." His standard work, "Studies in Baconian Light," of which he left an interleaved copy with additional hand-notes to the University-Library of Heidelberg, is sure to retain its sterling merit in the vexed Shakespeare-Controversy. It is sincerely to be regretted that this spirited book is but little known, as yet, and consequently hardly appreciated in Germany.

Quite the contrary is the case with *Sir Edwin's* book, "Bacon Is Shakespeare," which stole into our hearts by its alluring title, and which has become a household book in every great library even on this side of the Channel. It has become, as it were, the Symbol of the new Creed. Sir Edwin spared no pains and no expense to propagate his tenet all over the globe. A German translation of his well-known "broadsheet" was circulated at his expense, in 200,000 copies in this country, in Austria and Switzerland, three years ago.

Many criticisms on the book of Durning-Lawrence have appeared in Germany quite recently, in February, in one of the most popular periodicals in this country, the "Thurmer." Dr.

Gustave von Buchwald backed him up, in a spirited article, in opposition to the body of German professors who would appear to have resolved to decline all controversy, in the hope of silencing the Baconians.

Sir Edwin's book has, in fact, become a corner-stone of Bacon studies over here on the Continent. The big word "honorificabilitudinitatibus" has turned out a war-cry, by which party spirit and a lively interest for the Bacon-controversy has been awakened anew, in the Fatherland, after Edwin Bormann's time.

Yet I am sorry to state that things do not look promising or hopeful with us. We are still far from the goal. A true Bacon-biography has still to be written. Spedding, in his "Life of Bacon," was unfavourably influenced by his discovery of "Comentarius Solutus" in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields (as early as 1848) and by the arrival of Miss Delia Bacon in London soon after (1853). Since then he was, along with Carlyle, "blind to truth."

An unbiased biographer of Lord Verulam will have exactly to interpret: (1) The true meaning of "Vivitur ingenio" in Meres' "Palladis Tamia" (1598). (2) *Ben Jonson's* "Discoveries" (1635—36), which in fact represents a richly ornamented frame in which, from behind a thin veil, shines forth the colossal, the true image of Dominus Verulamius as Shakespeare-Nostras. (3) The flagrant artifices and intrigues of English Orthodoxy by which, since the Cabal Cabinet, the "glorious Argosy of the Plays, with portly sail," was purposely dwarfed and with diminutive "Shakspr" canvas set on the ocean of Time.

As reviewed from our retrospective scrutiny, this pious fraud appears to have been hatched on the sly, and heinously conducted and successively managed by Dryden, Rowe, and Pope. *John Dryden*, for one, had a false, idolatrous image (the Chandos portrait) made of an imaginary "genius" (1690—94). After this "image" had become a customary and familiar idol, *Rowe*, on this fantastical foundation, fabricated his fantastical biography (1709). Subsequently (1725—1747) the chief fraud was deliberately perpetrated by Alexander Pope, the calumniator of Bacon. It was Thersiter Pope who had the scandalous and provoking "Stratford Monument" (with the cushion) altered, nay, transformed and altogether changed into the *new* (1) Stratford monument "with pen (1) and manuscript." At about the same time (1740—41) this same "Shaks" was, on behalf of the State, recognised as "Great Shakespeare" in Westminster Abbey,



which is a stigma in English history that can only be rectified by an overt, manifest revocation.

If you add to these "solemn frauds" the falsifications of the Ireland forgeries believed as late as 1820, and the fabrications of "dishonest Payne Collier" (1835—49), then the case is made clear, the problem solved.

Unhappily, our two champions, the representatives of earnest Bacon-Studies, have been taken from our midst before such a peaceful solution had matured. Their memory, at all events, shall live in our hearts; they shall for ever stand high on the pedestal of honour when the chaff of senseless "Shakspr-myth" shall go rot and decay in the ruin of the times.

Heidelberg, May, 1914.

HOFRAS G. HOLZER.

---

## REVIEW.

*Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon.* By Edward George Harman, C.B. London: Constable and Company, Limited, 1914; 8vo royal, 608 pages, 16s. net.

MR. HARMAN has produced a remarkable book. It exhibits the result of many years' study of some of the most notable example of Elizabethan literature. The conclusions at which the autho. arrives are, to a great extent, novel. These conclusions are set out in no dogmatic manner, but are for the most part stated in modest terms as his opinions. The evidence relied on is internal rather than historical. The work is suggestive rather than convincing. That Francis Bacon was the author of the poems which were printed under the name of Edmund Spenser has been held by many Baconian students for years past. In "Tudor Problems" Mr. Parker Woodward has given weighty reasons for this belief. To a considerable extent, Mr. Harman travels over the same ground as did Mr. Woodward, but he has dealt with the subject more exhaustively.

In chapters on "The Shepherd's Callender," "The Faerie Queene," Spenser's "Minor Poems," Spenser's "Juvenile Poems," and Spenser's "View of the Present State of Ireland," a vast amount of new information is produced. The works under consideration are examined and commented upon at length, and the similarity in style and parallels in thought and expression between these works and Bacon's avowed writings are pointed out with singular perspicuity and telling force.

Mr. Harman makes the bold statement that the translations of some of the verses of Du Bellay and Petrarch, which appeared in Van der Noodt's "Theatre of Worldlings" in 1569 must be attributed to young Bacon when about eight or nine years of age. He

says: "I see nothing beyond the bounds of reason in the supposition that a boy of seven or eight, who was endowed with the genius which produced the 'Faerie Queene,' should have been able to write passable verses, especially where the material was supplied, and only called for translation. Then, as now, French was no doubt an early subject in the education of children of the well-to-do, and with good instruction it involves no great effort to acquire a fair command of that language in childhood. Moreover, all experience shows that great genius is precocious and begins production before, not after, other men. Pope, Congreve, Chatterton—in music, Handel and Mozart—and many other instances can be cited in support of this." Mr. Harman might have strengthened the probability of his contention by other examples. Agrippa D'Aubigne is a remarkable example of early proficiency in languages. At six years old he read Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and at ten he translated the "Crito." At eleven years of age Philip Melancthon produced a humorous comedy in Greek, which was publicly performed, and whilst in his twelfth year he composed his "Rudiments of the Greek Language," which was afterwards published. Macaulay described Bacon as possessing the most exquisitely constructed intellect which was ever bestowed on any of the children of men. In view of these examples of precocity, there is no improbability in young Francis translating "The Visions of Petrarch" from Clément Marot, or "The Visions of Bellay" at nine years of age.

In a chapter on "Spenser's Life" it is pointed out that his biographers have mainly relied on inferences drawn from the poems, and that where the external sources of information present difficulties they are discarded in favour of what is taken for internal evidence. Couthope's statement, cited by Grosart in his Life of Spenser, is quoted: "No poet ever kept a mask over his own features so long and so closely as Spenser."

Mr. Harman gives the supposed year of the poet's birth as 1552, but makes no mention of the fact that in the 1679 Folio of his works it is stated that he was born in London in 1510, and that prefixed to that edition is an engraving of his tomb bearing an inscription to the same effect. It was in 1778, when the tomb was restored, that the latter date of birth was substituted.

Mr. Harman's examination of the historical facts which are known of the life of that Edmund Spenser, who, in August, 1580, was appointed Secretary to Lord Grey de Wilton in Ireland, makes the belief impossible that he was the author of the poems bearing a similar name. The invented visits to London are shown to be improbable, if not impossible. The name was chosen to appear on the title-pages on account of the obscurity of the man and the inaccessibility of his habitation.

The various literary productions bearing the name of Sir Philip Sidney are next considered. Mr. Harman writes: "And here, perhaps, I had better make my confession at once that I

do not believe Sidney wrote a line of the principal works which are attributed to him" ("The Arcadia," "Astrophel and Stella," and "The Apologie for Poetrie"). And again: "That Sidney was not by inclination or practice a writer seems to me evident from the style of his letters."

The authorship of Leicester's "Commonwealth" is attributed to Bacon, and not for the first time. It appeared in 1584 under another title and was known as "Father Parson's Green Coat," from the green-edged leaves. It is said: "The book is a 'philippic' in which every resource of rhetoric is employed (probably in emulation of ancient models in style) with the object of rendering Leicester odious to the people and incensing the Queen against him. His execution even is advocated as the only means of saving the country from ruin and a renewal of the wars of succession." Mr. Harman considers that, although Bacon was frequently employed by Burghley in the underground business of Government, in writing this philippic he acted independently. "It was a desperate bid for employment when other means had so far failed; for a man who could wield such a pen would be worth securing, or at least disarming. . . . One thing is quite certain—that no one could have written this book who was not a lawyer, and also, as Sydney said, intimate with the life of the Court. He must also have had an exceptional memory and imagination and been a practised writer. There is no one except Bacon known to history in that time who combined these qualifications." In attributing the authorship to Bacon, Mr. Harman is probably right. There are in the pamphlet numerous tricks in expression which are peculiar to him. On page 62 of the 1641 edition will be found the words, "Only this I will say," a favourite phrase of his. But when its production is described as "a desperate bid for employment when other means had so far failed," the truth of the criticism may be questioned. From 1580 to 1592, Bacon was financially supported by Burghley in some great scheme in which he was engaged. He describes his uncle as "the second founder of my poor estate," and goes on to threaten a retirement from all Court and other work "if your Lordship (addressing Burghley) will not carry me on." His pen and the intelligence department controlled by him and his brother Anthony were during that period at Burghley's disposal. He could have as much employment as he wanted, but his thoughts and actions were devoted to other objects than official drudgery.

Mr. Harman opens entirely new ground when he associates Bacon with the authorship of some of the works bearing the name of George Gascoigne, with Robert Laneham's Letter and with Lodowick Bryskett's "Discourse of Civill Life." It has already been suggested that some of the literary work credited to Sir Walter Raleigh emanated from Bacon, but the evidence for this view has never been worked out in such a thorough manner as on the present occasion.

It is very natural to suppose that young Francis Bacon would

be present on the occasion of the Kenilworth festivities in honour of Queen Elizabeth. The account of the proceedings have come down to posterity in a small book published under date 25th March, 1576, as "The Princelye Pleasures at the Courts of Kenilworth." The title-page bore Gascoigne's literary motto, "*Tam Marti quam Mercurio*," but no author's name. It was included in a complete edition of his works published after his death.

Previously there had appeared a letter dated 20th August, 1575, addressed from the Court at the city of Worcester by one Robert Laneham to his friend Master Humphrey Martin, both of whom are described as mercers. In this letter an eye-witness gives a full report of the various functions and events which happened during the Queen's visit to Kenilworth. Both these accounts, in Mr. Harman's opinion, were written by the youthful Bacon,

Such, in brief, is an outline of the scope of Mr. Harman's book. It will repay reading and re-reading, and the student who will follow out the channels of enquiry suggested by it will learn much which, without its aid, he might never reach. There is a chapter headed "A Page in Bacon's Life" which is less satisfactory than those chapters which deal with literary matters. Nowhere does Mr. Harman convey to the reader any clear impression of the wonderful personality to whom he is attributing such phenomenal powers in early life. But the suggestions thrown out as to the work accomplished by the lad increases the fascination of the subject. A contemporary biographer says, "At twelve in industry he was above the capacity and in mind about the range of his contemporaries. . . . He was then the observation of wise men, as he became after the wonder of all." Mr. Harman helps his readers in some degree to appreciate what a wonder Francis Bacon was.

---



---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### A Significant Coincidence.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The "Tragedy of the death of Edward the Second" purports to be written by Christopher Marlowe.

It is a small quarto, and the copy to which I refer belongs to Mrs. Andrew Fiske, of Boston, and bears a running title upon its unnumbered pages of "The Tragedy of Edward the Second." In turning the pages, I was surprised to find one, and one only, bearing the running title "of Edward the Third." My first impression was of a misprint, but then realizing that there were no numerals, and that the word "third" was printed in full, I saw that the change was intentional, and I recognized the possible

touch of the hand of Francis Bacon. I sought at once in the text for some reason for so marked a signal, and the first line of the printed page revealed it. Below the running title "of Edward Third" were the words, "My Lord, ye shall be Chancelour of the Realme." This I find to be a significant coincidence. The following is a copy of the title page:—

THE  
TROUBLESOME  
RAIGNE AND LAMEN-  
table death of Edvard The  
Second, King of England :  
With  
The Tragical fall of proud  
Mortimer.

And also the life and death of Piers Gaveston, the great Earl of  
Cornewall and mighty Favorite of King Edward the Second.

As it was publikly Acted by the late Queenes' Maiesties  
Servants at the Red Bull in S. Johns Streete.

Written by Christopher Marlowe Gent.

---

LONDON,

Printed for Henry Bell and are to be sold at his shop, at the  
Lame-Hospital Gate, neere Smithfield, 1622.

Boston, April 25, 1913.

LUCY DERBY FULLER.

---

### Other Times Other Manners.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the *Daily Chronicle* of 19th May, 1914, Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., said of Mr. Rudyard Kipling that he "presented one of the most repulsive spectacles in history—the spectacle of real literary power and gifts applied to the mere stimulus and impulse of maligning a large mass of people."

"Mr. Kipling had shown that advancing years had left him more a vessel of wrath than he had ever been. At this critical period Mr. Kipling could bring no counsel and no better ingredients to the trouble than a double dose of that original sin of his—hatred and malice to all men with whom he did not see eye to eye." "Mr. Kipling," proceeded Mr. Robertson, "had done nothing to solve the problem of which fairly malignant Conservatives had come to see that it was incumbent to speak with moderation."

Mr. Robertson has evidently not exhausted the vituperative powers so extensively displayed in his book, "The Baconian Heresy," wherein he reviles and defames the numerous holders of a carefully reasoned opinion that the true author of the Shakespeare plays was Francis Bacon.

If Mr. Robertson will make the experiment of substituting

"Shaksperians" for "Conservatives" and "Robertson" for "Kipling" in his above quoted trenchant sentences, they will serve to describe what many Baconians think of his own interesting personality.

O. Y. Z.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—A "Lover of Facts" makes the unkind imputation that I do not love them. It is true I have a tendency to dissemble my love until a "fact" has been well tested and tried, but that, if a fault, is of the very essence of research in the underground passages of Francis Bacon's affairs.

Perhaps a "Lover of Facts" will tell me how it is established that of two persons bearing the name of Thomas Meautys the one who addressed a letter to Lady Jane Bacon was Bacon's former Secretary? Knowing the strong affection Bacon and this late Secretary had for each other, the terms of the announcement of the death are so unemotional as to justify an honest doubt as to whether the late Secretary was the writer of the letter.

She might also tell me how she obtains the fact that the late Secretary was Bacon's heir. He was not a blood relation. "Lover of Facts" should also give authority for her statements about the Arundel letter. The internal evidence does not make it clear whether Bacon wrote it or only dictated it, or whether such a letter was ever despatched, and certainly there is no proof that the writer from dictation was his Secretary.

"Lover of Facts" handles facts very carelessly. I have nowhere stated that Bacon pretended to die in order to know in what estimation he was held by men of letters. His affairs were not entangled or involved in April, 1626, nor were his trustees left to the mercy of the clamouring creditors. There was not twenty shillings in the £, but Bacon ordered his affairs so that they could be properly wound up and his whole estate distributed.

Bacon's Manor of Gorhambury is said to have been vested by him in trustees and was eventually conveyed to Sir Thomas Meautys, who after 1626 married Anne, surviving daughter of Sir Nathaniel Bacon (son of the Lord Keeper's eldest son, Sir Nicholas Bacon). Another account is that Anne married Sir Thomas Meautys, her cousin-german. As one Meautys (mentioned by Mrs. Bunten) was her uncle, and the other not her cousin-german, but only cousin to her mother, there is still the point to be cleared as to whom she really was married. Perhaps it was to a son of her mother's brother, also bearing the name of Thomas Meautys. Neither Spedding nor Montagu help to clear up these confusions. They both confound the two Nathaniel Bacons. One curious fact remains, for which we are much indebted to Mrs. Bunten, namely, that in the month that Francis Bacon is said to have died, a Thomas Meautys, relative of Nathaniel Bacon's wife, proceeded upon a six weeks' visit to the continent!

Will "Lover of Facts" give her (or his) name next time? Contributions to BACONIANA of this kind should not be anonymous.

PARKER WOODWARD.

Covers for Blue  
can be had

LONDON  
GAY & HANCOCK, LIMITED,  
10, ABINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C. 4.

250	Correspondence
246	Finds in the Folio
244	Ophelia and Liege
242	The Spare and its Lore
237	Chief Events in the Life of Sir Thomas Meautys
231	Jottings on Lord Bacon
227	The Rival Poet
218	"The Dark Lady" (Sonnets 127-142)
212	"The Golden Mettle of their Soldiers"
206	"Shakespeare and Asbies"
203	Stratford and St. Albans. A Contrast
197	The Date of New Year's Day

CONTENTS

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE

BACONIANA

OCTOBER, 1914.

No 48 (Third Series)

Vol XII

Price 1/-

# The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

---

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be:—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet; also his character, genius, and life; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakspeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

---

*The columns of BACONIANA are open for the expression of all shades of opinion on the subjects discussed therein, although such opinions may not be in accord with those held by the Council of the Society or the Editor of the Journal.*



# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1914. No. 48.

---

## THE DATE OF NEW YEAR'S DAY.

TO those who study 16th and 17th century Baconian literature, much trouble is often caused by the non-recognition of the date formerly used in various countries for New Year's day, and the consequent difference of year that ensued. Up to the year 1566 all European countries (I think) agreed upon March 25th as New Year's Day. Upon that day the year changed. This day continued in use in England until 1752, when the change to January 1st was made. But in France January 1st was adopted as New Year's Day in 1566, and in Scotland, King James VI. and his Council ordained, on December 17th, 1599, that on and after January 1st, 1600, the year should begin on January 1st, instead of March 25th.\* The confusion arising from this is very curious. A letter dated in France, "Feb., 1590," would correspond to "Feb., 1589," in England or Scotland;

\* I am indebted to M. Abel Le Franc, of the College de France and the Sorbonne for the French date, and to Sir James Balfour Paul, Lyon King, of the Scottish Heraldic College, for the Scotch date. I presume this information can be found in some English book of reference, but I know not where: even the omniscient Whitaker has not got it.

whereas if dated "Feb., 1590" in England or Scotland, it would correspond to "Feb., 1591" in France. But a letter dated "Feb., 1601" in France would correspond to the same date in Scotland, but to "Feb., 1600" in England.

In "A Concordancie of Years," by Arthur Hopton, printed by the Stationers' Company in London, of which I have an edition of 1616, there are remarks about the change of the year. After the manner of the time, Hopton plunges into a very classical disquisition on the subject, but does not give any practical information about the custom of our neighbour countries. But he says (pp. 66-7), "The Astronomers begin their year ye first of Januarie and so do we take it vulgarly in England. But ye Church of England and the date of all writings, and such like, hath their yeare to begin upon the 25th day of March."

I fancy that the confusion of this date was made worse by the fact that, as Hopton casually mentions, "we take it vulgarly in England" for the first day of January, and therefore we may sometimes have letters and even documents dated "vulgarly" without our knowing it, and years inextricably involved. This, I should think, was apt to be the case when writing to and from Scotland, or when going there, between January 1st and March 25th.

In Hopton's own book it is significant to note that he places the month of January as the commencing month of the year and not the month of March.

In the "Shepherd's Calendar," that came out anonymously in 1579, and was reproduced in four subsequent editions, up to 1597, all anonymous, the month of January is likewise placed first. At the beginning of the book there is a "General Argument," in which, quite in the Baconian style, the pros and cons are set forth for commencing the

year in January or March, and the writer expends much classical learning on the subject; and directs attention to the fact that Numa Pompilius called the month "January," as being "Janua anni," the gate of the year. And so the author of the Calendar "thinketh fit, according to the simplicities of common understanding, to beginne with Januarie." I presume that the expression, "simplicity of common understanding," is the precursor of Hopton's phrase "do take it vulgarly in England," noted above. The writer is himself plainly in favour of January as the commencing month of the year, and without forcing his opinion upon his readers, puts this forward as the wisest and soundest position to adopt. This is quite in the manner that Bacon followed throughout his career. "Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci," as his favourite motto set out. Of course, my opinion, as I showed in my little book, "Bacon's Secret Disclosed,"\* is that the "Shepherd's Calendar" was by Bacon and not Spenser, and that when he was only 18 years of age, it was the first of his many publications. This very Baconian disquisition of the beginning of the year is strongly confirmatory of Bacon's authorship. I am glad to see, also, in the latest book on Spenser,† that the author, Mr. Harman is quite confident that Bacon was the author of the "Shepherd's Calendar."

A very curious and confusing consequence of March 25th, New Year's Day, is to be seen in the book entitled, "Herbert's Travels in the East."

Sir Thomas Herbert (b. 1606, d. 1682) sailed in the suite of Sir Dodmore Cotton, accredited Ambassador to the King of Persia, in the East Indiaman,

\* Gay and Bird, 1911.

† Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Bacon, by C. E. Harman, C.B. London: Constable and Co., Ltd. 1914.

*The Rose*, for Gombrun, in the Persian Gulf. He afterwards published an account of his travels, the first edition (folio) was in 1634 the second in 1638 and there were subsequent editions.\* I picked up the second edition (1638) a few years ago, a handsome folio of 364 pages, containing many illustrations, the opening page of Books I. and III. being headed by the well-known "archer emblem"; while the letter at the head of Book I. is: "Travels Begun Anno 1626, Describing Divers Parts of Africk and Asia the Great," &c.

On page 2 his embarkation at Dover is mentioned in the following manner:

In the margin the year "1626" is noted, then he goes on to say, "Upon Good Friday, we took ship at Dover, having six great and well man'd ships along with us."

Remembering that Bacon's death was said to have taken place on Easter Sunday, April 9th, 1626, I was naturally interested to come upon a date—Good Friday, 1626—so close to that great event, and read on, hoping that some allusion to the great Bacon might, perchance, occur, as allusions to Bacon in the literature of his period are so rare and in such unlooked for places. My hopes in this respect were not fulfilled, but three or four lines further down Herbert says, the wind, "blew us the third day (double solemniz'd by being the feasts of Mother and Son) upon the Lizard's point or lands ends of England. . . . The wind blew fair, so as the seven and twentieth day we entred the Spanish Ocean, the Coast of Biscay neighbouring us."

So far everything seemed clear, and Herbert and his friends, having spent Easter Sunday at Lands End, on the 27th of the month entered the Spanish

\* Dictionary of National Biography.

Ocean ; from the 9th to the 27th was certainly a considerable time from Lands End to the Bay of Biscay, but then there is no information given of the number of days delayed by contrary winds, or so forth, at Lands End. A few lines lower down, however, after he has indulged in a quotation from Horace, and given an English translation of it in verse, he says : " In thirty hours the quarrell twixt wind and sea was ended, and joy in a serene sky reanimated us, so as wee ended March in chase of a Turkish Pirate, whom, with top-gallant top-sailes we pursued six houres, but (to our grieffe) he outsailed us. The first of April we cut our passage into the vast Atlantic Ocean."

Here was indeed a complication ; when I had thought that they had spent Sunday, April 9th, at Lands End, it seems that after all the sailing, and Pirate chasing, they had done, they had only ended March, and on April 1st passed into the great Atlantic Ocean. Plainly there was something very crooked about those dates and the usual refuge of the puzzled, that it was " a misprint," would not serve to straighten out the tangle, for Herbert's account was too circumstantial for that. So I had recourse to Almanacks, and found that Easter Sunday, 1626, was truly on April 9th ; the next Easter Sunday came on March 25th which would be New Year's Day of 1627 (old style), and the Good Friday corresponding to this was on March 23rd, and this day was in 1626 (old style). So we have the curious complication that in the year 1626 there were two Good Fridays, the first on April 7th, and the second on March 23rd. And therefore when Herbert says that he and his company took ship at Dover, on Good Friday, 1626, this might be either April 7th, 1626, or March 23rd following in what we would call 1627, and as a matter of fact it

was the latter date. But unless one had looked to this date very carefully one would have gone on with the impression that Herbert had begun his journey in 1626, and had continued from that year; whereas he did not sail until March 23rd, 1627.

Thus it is that many dates in the past have been inextricably confused, and a man has been supposed to have gone to a place in a certain year—and this vouched for by writings—whereas in reality it was a year later—or earlier.

I think the late change in England to January 1st as New Year's Day, accounts for the non-observance of the entry of the New Year as a general holiday. When March 25th was New Year's Day, its proximity to—and often identity with—Easter, made the Easter holiday absorb any New Year's holiday making that might have been thought of. But in Scotland the abandonment of Church days upon the incoming of the Reformation, caused New Year's Day, January 1st, to be taken up warmly, and it has remained a great day there ever since. In France "le jour de l'An" has for long been a great day of rejoicing, but I imagine it must have been taken up only after January 1st was adopted. It is curious that in England it has never become a holiday. Being too close to Christmas is probably the reason. Christmas has never been a great holiday—*i.e.*, day of no work, but of jollification—in France; and Christmas being a Church festival was "taboo" in Presbyterian Scotland. Therefore in both these countries January 1st came as a "boon and a blessing."

GRANVILLE C. CUNNINGHAM.

## STRATFORD AND ST. ALBANS.

## A CONTRAST.

STRATFORD-ON-AVON has all the appearance of a prosperous shrine. Scores of thousands of pilgrims annually resort there to visit the "birthplace," the Shakespeare bust and gravestone in the chancel of the church, the Memorial Theatre, Library, and Picture Gallery, and the many places associated with the actor-author tradition.

The income from the show places is most substantial. Buildings that but for the poet's birthplace assumption would have been swallowed in the ruin of time, have been carefully preserved and illustrate the old half timber work of Elizabethan times.

Caretakers, vergers, guides were all absolutely assured that England's great Poet and Dramatist was the man player born, died and buried at Stratford-on-Avon. It was anathema to doubt, question, or disbelieve.

Nay, to do so was alien to the spirit of the place. Rare doubting Thomases of the reading public could there obtain relief from mental hesitations, just as sufferers from bodily rheums benefit at Bath or Buxton. A friend once assured me that all his doubts had been effectually dispelled by what he saw and heard at Stratford. "*My boy, the people there have got the documents and have absolutely assured me there is no question that the actor wrote the plays.*"

From that date my friend ceased to worry over the postulations of misguided, self-illuding Baconians.

Subsequently, when I in my turn went to Stratford, there seemed just a slight indication that the position was considered to be somewhat less sound and that the authorities were preparing a strategic position in their rear. Francis Bacon's works were on sale in

a case in the Library, and his engraved portrait (though not mentioned in the official guide) was hung in the Picture Gallery! *Verbum sap.*

#### THE ST. ALBAN'S SHRINE.

Here the Abbey Church was *the only centre of interest* to visiting strangers.

Should any casual antiquary seek the ruins of old Gorhambury House he must apply to the kindly agent of the Gorhambury Estate. After a long drive to the park surrounding the modern mansion an iron hurdle has to be temporarily moved, and the way is over grass to the right of the mansion. There is no defined path. Pilgrims have not been numerous enough to tread one. At length on high ground we came upon a small ruin of crumbling stone, slightly held together by iron bands and supports.

This, then, was all that was left of the famous mansion which once afforded rest, shelter and recreation to Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, and his friends.

His expectation of this result is finely expressed in one of the poems he, as a disappointed young man, put out in the name of Spenser (the one time sizar of Pembroke College, who accompanied Earl Grey de Wilton to Ireland in 1580 as a clerk).

#### "THE RUINES OF TIME."

"Verlame I was. What boots it that I was  
Sith now I am but weedes and wastfull gras.

\* \* \* \*

Why then dooth flesh a bubble glas of breath  
Hunt after honour and advancement vaine  
And reare a trophee for devouring death  
With no great labour and long lasting paine  
As if his daies for ever should remaine?  
Sith all that in this world is great or gaie  
Doth as a vapour vanish and decaie."



Bacon used the same thoughts in his "Shakespeare" plays, and in the one poem, "Life is a Bubble," ascribed to his authorship.

After the ruins we visited the little church of St. Michael, alleged to contain Bacon's ashes. The church was locked, and only after calling at two or three houses were we able to obtain the key.

There in the chancel, in a position corresponding to that of the Shakespeare bust in Stratford Church, is the fine large marble statue of our great poet philosopher.

Like some massive effigy of Budha upon a lonely Eastern mountain, the Bacon statue dominates the little church so effectively as to make it seem to be merely a private shrine. There sits, solemn, thoughtful, dignified and patient the sculptured counterpart of England's superman; waiting—waiting—waiting—for the fame which he postulated should only come to a man after death.

He trusted to his "powerful rhyme."

"For deeds doe die how ever noblie donne  
And thoughts of men do as themselves decay,  
But wise words taught in numbers for to runne  
Recorded by the Muses live for ay."

PARKER WOODWARD.

“SHAKESPEARE AND ASBIES.”

TO THE EDITOR OF “*BACONIANA*.”

SIR,—In your July number, Mr. Harold Hardy gave a criticism of my paper on this subject, which is occasionally misleading. He implies that I use Halliwell-Phillipps' work without acknowledgment, and do not “add” to it, whereas I only criticise his facts, and expand them through further and fuller information. On the other hand, I do not claim to have discovered the document in the State papers, which places John Shakespeare among “the gentlemen and freeholders of Warwickshire,” 1850. I only pointed out that “none of the Baconians seem to have noted it,” as the chief of them repeat that the poet was “an illiterate peasant lad,” which does not harmonize with this synchronous classification of his father. I fancied that I did understand the legal technicalities connected with the transfer of land and “the levying of a fine,” through the many thousands of cases I had analysed, though I would not call the seller “defendant” as Mr. Hardy does, but “deforciant.” I am aware of the steps that Edmund Lambert made John Shakespeare take to secure him, but they were quite consistent with the processes of a mortgage, and the story John Shakespeare afterwards tells (which I am inclined to believe, after a careful study of the papers).

Mr. Hardy does not seem to have realised the meaning of the repeated “proclamations” which I pointed out.

I cannot conceive how he can attempt to deny my simple statement that William Shakespeare's name was first written in *London* in the “*Coram Rege* Rolls,” and first spoken in the Law Courts, whether the case proceeded or not. I put my words in italics because

the Baconians are in the habit of asking the question :  
 " Where could Shakespeare have learnt his law ? "

Mr. Hardy occasionally uses terms very loosely, as when he speaks of John Shakespeare's "*other indiscretion*," without having, even distantly, alluded to his previous "*indiscretion*," which was an important discovery of mine bearing on the causes of John's money difficulties at the time. I do *not*, as my critic would suggest, sympathise with John Shakespeare in relation to the story, but with his wife and his son.

Finally, Mr. Hardy finds fault with a suggestion which he attributes to me, that William Shakespeare was a descendant of the Beauchamps. I had really said that the Park Hall Ardens had intermarried with the Beauchamps (which their pedigree shows), and I have elsewhere collected my materials for my logical inference, that the Wilnecote Ardens had descended from the Park Hall Ardens, which were the "*historic family*" to which I referred. They themselves acknowledge the connection. It is curious that Mr. Hardy should, after all, acknowledge in conclusion what I had started to prove, the connection between Asbies and the course of Shakespeare's life.

I am, Yours faithfully,

CHARLOTTE C. STOPES.

---

The proof of the foregoing letter was submitted to Mr. Harold Hardy, who sends the following reply thereto.

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged for the copy of Mrs. Stopes' letter, and for the opportunity of adding a reply. It is a matter of small importance whether Mrs. Stopes' articles on "*Shakespeare and Asbies*," purported to "*add*" to the facts contained in the documents published by Mr. Halliwell-Phillips, or

whether the writer claims only to criticise those facts, as Mrs. Stopes says, "and expand them through further and fuller information." I still maintain—and there is nothing in Mrs. Stopes' letter to alter the opinion—that on the subject of "Shakespeare and Asbies," Mrs. Stopes, who has evidently been industrious in her researches, adds very little to our information, and so far as criticism is concerned, her inferences are unconvincing and misleading.

Mrs. Stopes now tells us that the purpose of her articles was to prove the connection between Asbies and the course of Shakespeare's life. That is certainly a harmless theme. But it is impossible for anyone to read her articles without being impressed with the writer's evident desire to convey the opinion that, in the litigation relating to Asbies between the Shakespeares and John Lambert, the latter was entirely in the wrong and that the Shakespeares were very harshly treated.

The object of my article was to show that there is another side to the story; and from the documentary evidence it appears that the litigation promoted by the Shakespeares was vexatious, and never ought to have been instituted. The first action brought by the Shakespeares, which was based upon allegations of fraud, was not proceeded with; the second proceeding was dismissed with costs; and the third was abandoned. No wonder Mrs. Stopes now frankly admits that she does not sympathise with John Shakespeare in relation to the story. But if William Shakespeare as the heir apparent of John Shakespeare was a party to the action—"probably instructed the attorneys, and did all the personal duties of a complainant," as Mrs. Stopes imagines—it is difficult to understand why she should have more sympathy with the son than with the father, in respect of the same vexatious litigation.

The bias of Mrs. Stopes is apparent throughout her articles. It is clearly indicated by such phrases as the following :—

“ Again John Shakespeare trusted his brother-in-law's word.”

“ And again the Shakespeares trusted a Lambert's word.”

In fact Mrs. Stopes treats all the allegations made by the Shakespeares in the pleadings as if they were true ; while she ignores the allegations of John Lambert, which are far more likely to be correct, because the story put forward by the Shakespeares is highly improbable and their litigation was undoubtedly a hopeless failure.

I don't know whether these failures in litigation suggest to Mrs. Stopes that the Shakespeares' attorney was well versed in the law, but it is clear that she thinks they are to be taken as evidence of a knowledge of law on the part of the lay client. This is the inference of Mrs. Stopes—two actions abandoned and one dismissed with costs, and all relating to the same bogus claim, indicate clearly how William Shakespeare acquired the knowledge of law which permeates the works that bear his name.

In spite of the protest in Mrs. Stopes' letter, I cannot understand why she persists in her “ simple ” statement that the name of William Shakespeare was first spoken in London in the Law Courts, merely because he was plaintiff in an action which never came into court. This is only one of the inferences which I have ventured to describe as unconvincing and misleading.

Here is another inference of the same class. Mrs. Stopes says :—

“ Shakespeare found work at the theatre, seems to have been liberally treated, though at first servitor or

apprentice, and soon had a home in Bishopsgate Street, on which he was assessed higher than either of the Burbages," and then follows this amazing proposition, "*So it may reasonably be inferred he had his family with him at least by 1594 for a time.*" This is surely a novel suggestion, that William Shakespeare's wife and children came to London from Stratford and lived with the player in Bishopsgate Street.

I have already called attention in my July article to the erroneous inference drawn by Mrs. Stopes from the entry, which she quotes as showing that the depositions of the witnesses were in favour of the Shakespeares. It is sufficient, therefore, to say that Mrs. Stopes has not even attempted to give any explanations of her mistake.

As to Mrs. Stopes' captious comment that I used the word "defendant" instead of "deforciant," I should have thought it was obvious to anyone from the context that I was explaining, in what lawyers call popular language, the technicalities of "levying a fine"; and as the word "defendant" is commonly known, it was preferred to the word "deforciant," which may not be so familiar to everybody. But, apart from that, to show how paltry is the criticism, I may add that the words "defendant" and "plaintiff" are used in this very connection in "Stephen's Commentaries"; and, if the learned author of that work had not analysed many thousands of cases, as Mrs. Stopes claims to have done, he at any rate knew what he was writing about.

And now may I appeal to Mrs. Stopes to enlighten us, by explaining the importance she attaches to "the repeated proclamations"? In her article in the "Athenæum," she mentions fifteen proclamations. I don't know whether this is a slip, but the usual number was sixteen, that is to say, four times in four successive terms.

There is only one other matter—Mrs. Stopes complains that I mentioned John Shakespeare’s “other indiscretion” without having alluded to his previous indiscretion. Now, it appears from Mrs. Stopes’ researches that “John Shakespeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, yeoman,” was fined a sum of £20 for failing to appear on a summons to be bound over to keep the peace; and a further fine of £20 was imposed upon him for failing in his obligation as a surety. This is what Mrs. Stopes describes as an important discovery, and she glories in having brought it to light. But if a Baconian had made such a dive into the murky past of John Shakespeare, there can be no doubt that the orthodox Shakespearean would have instantly cried out about throwing mud at the historic family, which was listed among “the Gentlemen and Freeholders of Warwick.” Mrs. Stopes expresses herself rather vaguely, but she realises that the affair was not very creditable. She says:—

“Whether he did not appear as a defendant or as witness in some case when summoned, or whether he had committed some trespass, or had had a free fight with someone . . . I have not been able to prove.”

Someday, perhaps, we shall get something more illuminating.

HAROLD HARDY.

“THE GOLDEN METTLE OF THEIR  
SOLDIERS.”

SIR WALTER RALEIGH'S "History of the World" is most profitable ground for Baconian study, and in the course of browsings thereon, I have found not only the extremely Shake-Spearian line which heads this article, but also so much germane to the matter absorbing Britain at present—our soldiers and their gallantry—that I can but set it down.

“It is not my purpose to disgrace the Roman valour (which was very noble) or to blemish the reputation of so many famous victories. I am not so idle. This I say: that among all their wars, I find not any wherein their valour hath appeared comparable to the English. If my judgment seems over partial, our wars in France may help to make it good. . . . Let us generally compare with the deeds done by the best of Roman soldiers in their principal service, the things performed in the same country by our common English soldiers levied in haste from following the cart, or sitting on the shop-stall, so shall we see the difference.”

If any man ask how then came it to pass that the English won so many great battles, having no advantage to help him? I may, with best commendation of modesty refer him to the French historian, who relating the victory of our men at *Crevant* when they passed a bridge in face of the enemy had these words:

“The English comes with a conquering bravery as he that was accustomed to gain everywhere without any stay.”

“Great odds in weapon gave to the *Romans* the honours of many gallant victories. What such help? or what other worldly help than the golden mettle of their soldiers had our English Kings? . . . .



All that have read of *Cressi* and *Agincourt* will bear me witness that I do not alledge the Battle of *Poictiers*, for lack of other, as good examples of the English virtue, the proof whereof hath left a hundred better marks in all quarters of France than ever did the valour of the Romans.”

In speaking of our Kings, Raleigh’s History says :—

“ Who so notes their proceedings may find that none of them went to work like a Conqueror save only Henry V.”

It has much to say about that King, and gives us words of Captain Gam, the Davy Gam, Esquire, of Shake-Speare [Henry V., A. IV., S. VIII.] spoken to the King before Agincourt, with this comment of his own : “ Such words as these are not without their moment.” Throwing light on why Davy Gam, Esquire, was honoured by special mention in the great play. There seems little doubt that much of the “ History of the World ” known as Raleigh’s, if not all, was Francis Bacon’s work. Certainly the Play of Henry V. bears many signs of being written by the same hand as the History called Raleigh’s. Take for instance the idea of Thanksgiving,\* such a salient point in them and Bacon. “ There is a foolish and wretched pride wherewith men being transported can ill endure to ascribe to God the honour of their actions in which it has pleased Him to use their own industry, courage or foresight. Therefore it is commonly seen that they who entering into battle are careful to pray for aid from Heaven, with due acknowledgment of His power, Who is the giver of victory, when the field is won do vaunt of their own exploits, one telling how he got such a ground advantage, another how he gave check to such a battalion ; a

\* “ Concerning the Liturgy . . . that it consist as well of lauds and hymns and Thanksgivings as of petitions.”—Francis Bacon “ Of the Church.”

## 214 "The Golden Mettle of their Soldiers."

third how he seized on the enemy's canon, everyone striving, to magnify himself, whilst all forget God, as one that had not been present in the action. . . . This is true that as he which findeth better success than he did or in reason might expect, is deeply bound to acknowledge God the Author of his happiness, so he whose meer wisdom and labour hath brought things to a prosperous issue is doubly bound to show himself thankful both for the victory and for those virtues by which the victory was gotten, and indeed so far from weaknesses the nature of such Thanksgiving, that it may well be called the height of magnanimity; no virtue being so truly heroical as that by which the spirit of man advanceth itself with confidence of acceptation unto the love of God;"—[p. 319, II. Book.]

The counterpart of this attitude of mind we find in *Henry V.* "The Mirror of all Christian Kings." Act. II., S. II.

*King*: "Let us deliver our puissance into the hand of God, putting it straight in expedition."

"We are in God's hand brother, not in theirs."

Act. III., S. VII.

"O God of battles! Steal my soldier's hearts! Possess them not with fear! . . . Pluck their hearts from them not to-day, O Lord!"

"You know your places. God be with you all."

and *after* the battle, Act. IV., S. 7, 8, note this:—

"Praised be God, and not our strength for it!"

"O God, Thy arm was here, and not to us but to Thy arm alone ascribe we all. . . . Take it God! For it is only Thine!"

"Come, go we in procession to the Village; and be it death . . . to boast of this or take that praise from God which is His only."

"God fought for us . . . Do we all holy rites; let there be sung *Non nobis* and *Te Deum*."

Raleigh's History, with its praise of *Henry V.*, lest

it “ flies too high over men’s heads,” was followed up by the Play of *Henry V.*: “ I have a purpose,” says Bacon to James I., “ to draw it (this lesson) to the sense by some patterns of a natural story, (for) the general good of men in their very being, and in the dowries of nature, and . . . in society.”

“ The platform draws on the building,” imitating, as he tells us, Seneca, “ who spent his time in writing books of excellent argument and use for *all ages.*” Thus Shake-Speare, our own “ *Brand or burning Torch,\** “ enlighteneth the whole circuit of the earth.”

Shake-Speare and Raleigh both bring Talbot into prominence.

“ The English virtue of the Lord John Talbot, Viscount Lisle, son to that famous Earl of Shrewsbury, who died in the battle of *Chastillon* ” is, as the History tells us: “ highly to be honoured.”

“ Talbot was in the flower of his youth, unhurt, easily able to have escaped and not answerable for that day’s misfortune when he refused to forsake his father who exhorted this his noble son to be gone and leave him.”

How Shake-Speare valued the valorous name of Talbot we may judge by the fact that he mentions it seventy-four times!

Both the History and Play of *Henry V.* had a special purpose in view, the education of Prince Henry, and the development in him of the valour and virtue of his namesake. Francis’ hope of seeing him a second Henry V., to quote the History’s words on that king, “ it pleased God to interrupt by his death.”

Francis Bacon, in his own name, gives us most suggestive remarks on war and “ its sinews ” in his *King Henry VII.* That king, he says, with “ wisdom admirable,” ordered “ All houses of husbandry

\* Bacon’s “ Wisdom of the Ancients.”

## 216 "The Golden Mettle of their Soldiers."

with twenty acres of ground and upwards should be maintained and kept up for ever. . . By this means the houses did of necessity enforce a dweller not to be a beggar (but) might keep hinds and servants and set the plough on going. This did wonderfully concern the might and mannerhood of the kingdom . . . and did in effect amortise a great part of the lands of the kingdom unto the hold and occupation of the *yeomanry* . . . Now how much this did advance the military power of the kingdom is apparent by the true principles of other kingdoms. . . . The principal strength of an army consisteth in the Infantry or Foot, and to make good Infantry it requireth men *bred* . . . in some free and plentiful manner. Therefore if a State run most to noblemen and gentlemen and that the husbandmen and ploughmen be but as . . . mere cottagers . . . you may have good Cavalry, but never profitable good stable bands of foot . . . Thus did the King secretly sow Hydra's teeth, whereupon should rise up armed men for the service of the kingdom."

He also besides this draws attention to the want of Yeomanry in France and its bad effect on the Army. How perfectly are these truths accentuated in the play *Henry V.*, whose "*Hydra-headed* wilfulness so soon was lost."

*King* : On, on, yon noblest English,  
 And yon good *yeomen* show us here  
 The *mettle* of your pasture ; let us swear  
 That you are worth your *breeding* ; which  
 I doubt not. For there is none of you so mean and  
 base  
 That hath not noble *\*lustre* in your eyes."  
 Act. II., S. I.

\* *Lustre* is used together with *mettle* by Raleigh in his war passages.

## “ The Golden Mettle of their Soldiers.” 217

Hoping to attack the question of Raleigh's “ History of the World ” at greater length on some future occasion, I close, adding some significant words :

“ We, I say, ought to acknowledge that no Nations are wholly aliens and strangers the one to the other . . . Now if there be such a . . . league . . . sure it is not idle; It is against somewhat, or something: Who should they be? Is it against wild beasts? Or the elements of fire and water? No, it is against such Routs and Shoals of People as have utterly degenerate from the Laws of Nature; As have in their very Body and frame of Estate a Monstrosity; and may be truly accounted . . . common enemies and grievances of mankind; Or disgraces and reproaches to human nature. Such people, all nations are interested, and ought to be resenting, to suppress.” Francis Bacon, *Of an Holy War*.

ALICIA AMY LEITH

## "THE DARK LADY."

(SONNETS 127-142).

"Black is the badge of hell."—*Love's Labour Lost*, IV, 3.

**S**HAKESPEARE, finding that "Time's injurious hand" has been at work upon his features, turns his thoughts to death. He would be gone from worldly vanities, "save that, to die, I leave my love alone" (*Sonnet 66*). The thought "that Time will come and take my love away," is, he says, "as a death," and he resolves to take comfort in his determination "to fortify against confounding age's cruel knife," by building an eternal monument of the conceptions of his brain, and under such a tomb will he hide. (*Sonnet 17*). He strives for the immortality of this "better part," and is regardless of personal fame:—

"From hence your memory death cannot take,  
Although in me each part will be forgotten,  
Your name from hence immortal life shall have,  
Though I, once gone, to all the world must die;  
The earth can yield me but a common grave,  
When you entombed in men's eyes shall lie,  
Your monument shall be my gentle verse,  
Which eyes, not yet created, shall o'er-read."

—*Sonnet 81*.

"When I perhaps compounded am with clay,  
Do not so much as my poor name rehearse:  
But let your love even with my life decay."—*Sonnet 71*.

"My name be buried where my body is."—*Sonnet 72*.

"Upon thy side against myself I'll fight,  
And prove thee virtuous, though thou art forsworn.  
With my own weakness being best acquainted,  
Upon thy part (*i.e.* against myself) I can set down a story  
Of faults concealed, wherein I am attainted;  
That thou, in losing me, shalt win much glory;

And I by this will be a gainer too ;  
 For, bending all my loving thoughts on thee,  
 The injuries that to myself I do,

Doing thee vantage, double-vantage me.”—*Sonnet* 88.

But something comes between the poet and the “beauteous and lovely youth” (his Muse). In *Sonnets* 97-119, he reproaches himself with an “absence” from him, and poignantly laments :—

“ Alas, ’tis true, I have gone here and there,  
 And made myself a motley to the view,  
 Gor’d mine own thoughts, sold cheap what is most dear,  
 Made old affections of offences new.”

He chides Fortune,—the cause of his absence, and “the guilty goddess of my harmful deeds—that she did not better for my life provide than public means which public manners breed.” His name has received “a brand,” and “vulgar scandal” is stamped upon his brow. The experiences, endured in this absence, have tormented his soul and led him, as it were, into hell itself :—

“ What potions have I drunk of Syren tears,  
 Distill’d from limbecs foul as *hell* within,  
 Applying fears to hopes, and hopes to fears,  
 Still losing when I saw myself to win !  
 What wretched errors hath my heart committed,  
 Whilst it hath thought itself so blessed never !  
 How have mine eyes out of their spheres been fitted  
 In the distraction of this madding fever.”

It would seem that he went about in fear of his life for, in *Sonnet* 74, he imagines that “when that fell arrest without all bail” shall carry him away, it will be as a prey to “the coward conquest of a wretch’s knife.”

All this fits in significantly with Bacon’s connection with the unfortunate Essex business, 1600-1. The law (“public means which public manners breed”) was distasteful to him, but circumstances urged the necessity of such a career. After the Essex trial, he was subjected to a “vulgar scandal,” and was in fear

of assassination.\* He returns penitently to his Muse, vowing "mine appetite I never more will grind," to his old "love" whom he describes as "next my heaven the best":—

"O benefit of ill! now I find true  
That better is by evil still made better;  
And ruin'd love, when it is built anew  
Grows fairer than at first, more strong, far greater.  
So I return rebuk'd to my content,  
And gain by ill thrice more than I have spent."

Just as he rails on Lady Fortune in *Sonnet III*, he upbraids the dark lady for separating him and his "love":—

"Beshrew that heart that makes my heart to groan  
For that deep wound it gives my friend and me;  
Is't not enough to torture me alone,  
But slave to slavery my sweet'st friend must be?  
Me from myself thy cruel eye hath taken,  
And my next self thou harder hast engross'd;  
Of him, myself and thee, I am forsaken.—*Sonnet 133.*

This mistress (the "woman colour'd ill") is, in my opinion, the *personification of Fortune*. Her complexion is painted. She has usurped "the lineaments of Nature":—

"For since each hand hath put on Nature's power,  
Fairing the foul with art's false borrow'd face."

Her "painting and usurping hair" denote her power by artifice to "ravish doters with a false aspect" (*Love's Labour's Lost*, IV., 3).

In his eyes she is an abhorrence. He has been betrayed by her, yet, in his heart, he dotes on her:—

\* After the Essex affair, Bacon writes to Cecil, "I knew no remedy against libels and lies; . . . as for any violence to be offered to me, wherewith my friends tell me to no small terror that I am threatened, I thank God I have the privy coat of good conscience."

Also to Howard, "For my part, I have deserved better than to have my name objected to envy, or my life to a ruffian's violence."

And to the Queen, "My life has been threatened, and my name libelled."



“ In faith, I do not love thee with mine eyes,  
For they in thee a thousand errors note ;  
But 'tis my heart that loves what they despise,  
Who, in despite of view, is pleas'd to dote.”—*Sonnet 141.*

“ For thou betraying me, I do betray,  
My nobler part to my gross body's treason.—*Sonnet 151.*

He can write of her :—

“ Thou are as tyrannous, so as thou art  
As those whose beauties proudly make them cruel :  
For well thou know'st to my dear doting heart  
Thou art the fairest and most precious jewel.”

and yet she is not really beautiful :—

“ My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun ;  
Coral is far more red than her lips' red ;  
If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun ;  
If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head,  
I have seen roses damask'd red and white,  
But no such roses see I in her cheeks.”

These descriptions are widely inconsistent, and it is impossible for me to believe that any “ mistress ” other than some shape of the poetic imagination was intended.\* His infatuation seems as fickle as Fortune herself !

According to Shakespeare :—

I. Fortune is *unkind* :—

“ For herein Fortune shows herself more kind than is her custom.”—*Merchant of Venice*, IV., 1.

\* In “ Shelton's ” *Don Quixote* (Part II., Ch. I.), there is, in this connection, some interesting information. Don Quixote says to Sancho —

“ For it is an ordinary thing amongst *poets*, once disdained or not admitted by their *feigned* mistresses (feigned indeed because they feign they love them) to revenge themselves with satires and libels,—a revenge truly unworthy noble spirits.”

In Part I., Bk. III., Ch. XI., he writes,—“ For all the poets who celebrate certain ladies at pleasure, thinkest thou they all had mistresses ? No.” He then goes on to deny that the “ Amaryllises, the Phyllises, Silvias, Dianas,” &c., “ were truly ladies of flesh and bones.”

## "The Dark Lady."

2. She is *fickle* :—

"O, Fortune, Fortune! all men call thee fickle."

*Romeo and Juliet*, III., 5.

3. She is a *strumpet* :—

"O, most true; she (Fortune) is a strumpet."

*Hamlet* II., 2.

The black mistress answers these qualifications :—

1. "O, call not me to justify the wrong,

That thy *unkindness* lays upon my heart."—*Sonnet* 139.

2. "Those lips of thine,

That have profaned their scarlet ornaments,  
And seal'd false bonds of love as oft as mine."

—*Sonnet* 148.

3. "If eyes, corrupt by over-partial looks,

Be anchored in the bay where all men ride,

Why of eyes' falsehood hast thou forged hooks,

Whereto the judgment of my heart is ty'd?

Why should my heart think that a several plot (*i.e.*  
enclosed field)

Which my heart knows the wide world's common-place?"

—*Sonnet* 137.

In *Troilus and Cressida* (III. 3), Shakespeare observes, "some men creep in skittish Fortune's hall, while others play the idiot in her eyes." Shakespeare is one of those who creep :—

"Be it lawful I love thee, as thou lov'st those

Whom thine eyes woo as mine importune thee :

Root pity in thy heart that when it grows,

Thy pity may deserve to pitied be."—*Sonnet* 148.

In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare says they are blessed "whose blood and judgment are so well commingled, they are not a pipe for Fortune's finger to sound what stop she please." In *Sonnet* 128, he pictures his mistress playing, not the pipe—for that would destroy the illusion—but the virginal :—

"Upon that blessed wood whose motion sounds

With thy sweet fingers."

He has pursued her feverishly, only to find himself "her neglected child." Now the word "child" is

very significant, for we often speak of a “ child of Fortune,” and would not be an appropriate term if the poet is referring to a living being. He can gain no “ fair acceptance ” in her will, but, so irresistible is she, that he cannot turn back :—

“ But my five wits, nor my five senses can,  
Dissuade one foolish heart from serving thee,  
Who leaves unsway'd the likeness of a man,  
Thy proud heart's slave, and vassal wretch to be ;  
Only my plague thus far I count my gain,  
That she that makes me sin awards me pain.”

—*Sonnet 141.*

In other words, he has met with “ Fortune's buffets,” and not with any of her “ rewards.”

The mistress of whom he has found himself “ mad in pursuit ” is pictured in the poet's eye as black, because it is a colour of evil and symbolical of the *hell* which he feels within him :—

“ For I have sworn thee fair, and thought thee bright  
Who art as black as *hell*, as dark as night.—*Sonnet 147.*”

“ None knows well,  
To shun the heaven that leads me to this *hell*.”—

—*Sonnet 129.*

“ To win me soon to *hell*, my female evil  
Tempteth my better angel from my side,  
And would corrupt my saint to be a devil.”—*Sonnet 144.*

“ The desire of power in excess,” observes Bacon, in the *Essay of Goodness*, “ caused the angels to fall.” He believed he was born for the service of his countrymen, and, to that end, had “ taken all knowledge to be his province.” The sin of worldly ambition had tempted his “ angel ” (the holiest and best of all things—knowledge and philosophy—the pursuit of divine philosophy, to which he considered himself dedicated), and would procure the “ fall ” of his high ideals and divine contemplations. A genius is a man who makes the following of his star

the one immensely important thing in his life, and sees other mundane things—riches, honour, fame, &c., in their true proportions as of little value. Such is the view expressed in Dr. Turck's remarkable book, "The Man of Genius," which, since it was first published in 1896 in Germany, has been through seven editions. Dr. Turck discusses the character of Hamlet as a man of genius. Why does Hamlet delay to "sweep to his revenge"? Why does he seem to hesitate, waver? Simply because he is a genius, because he possesses an objective disinterested eye for things detached from mere circumstance. Dr. Turck observes:—

"It is not sorrow for the loss of his father that puts him beside himself, but rather his deep grief at the destruction of his fair ideal of the world, that paralyses his energy. Too greatly moved by his longings for the highest form of existence, he is unable to attach his soul to what is petty and personal. Yet he still believes himself bound by personal considerations, while his innermost soul struggles to soar far above it."

*Hamlet* was published in 1603. The *Sonnets* were written about that date. The tragedy of *Hamlet*, and of the author of the *Sonnets*, was playing a part for which Nature had not fitted him. The coincidence is a striking one, and points to Shakespeare having delineated his own passions in the character of Hamlet.

To return to "the dark lady." Fortune did not smile on Shakespeare for the abandonment of his "love" of comfort, for this one of "despair." The "expense of spirit" in her favour was wasted. No wonder, having "sold cheap what is most dear" to "ambition of the meaner sort," and meeting only with Fortune's "slings and arrows," the temptress appeared so hateful in his eyes!

According to Shakespeare, Fortune has no love; it is her custom to be *unkind*. Other characteristics are *blindness* and *inconstancy*:—

"That goddess blind."—*Henry V.*, III., 6.

"She is painted also with a wheel, to signify to you, which is the moral of it, that she is turning and inconstant."  
—*Ibid.*

These attributes are found in the dark mistress :—

"I am perjur'd most  
For all my vows are oaths but to misuse thee,  
And all my honest faith in thee is lost ;  
For I have sworn deep oaths of thy deep *kindness*,  
Oaths of thy *love*, thy *truth*, thy *constancy* :  
And, to enlighten thee, gave eyes to *blindness*,  
Or made them swear against the thing they see ;  
For I have sworn thee fair, more perjur'd I,  
To swear, against the truth, so foul a lie !

—*Sonnet 152.*

The following aphorisms of Francis Bacon will be found to be reflected in the "dark lady" sonnets :—

"Inconstancy of Fortune with inconstancy of mind, makes a dark scene."

"He who hastens to be rich, shall not be innocent."

"Riches are the baggage of virtue ; they cannot be spared nor left behind, but they hinder the march."

"Great riches have sold more men than ever they have bought out."

"Men seem neither to understand their riches, nor their strength ; of the former they believe greater things than they should, and of the latter much less. And from hence fatal pillars have bounded the progress of learning."

"Fortune is not content to do a man one ill turn."

"Fortune has somewhat of the nature of a woman, who, if she be too much wooed, is commonly the farther off."\*

\* Precisely the theme of Sonnet 143, where Shakespeare compares the Dark Lady with a "housewife" (in *As You Like It*, he refers to the "housewife Fortune") running to catch one of her feathered creatures which has broken away, "whilst her neglected child holds her in chace." Shakespeare imagines himself as that tearful infant who

Cries to catch her whose busy care is bent  
To follow that which flies before her face,  
Not prizing her poor infant's discontent ;  
So run'st thou after that which flies from thee,  
Whilst I, thy babe, chace thee afar behind.

Shakespeare asks :—

"Who would not wish to be from wealth exempt,  
Since riches point to misery and contempt?"  
*Timon of Athens* IV., 2.

The "good set terms" in which Shakespeare "railed on Lady Fortune," do not point to his having been one of her favoured minions :—

"Mudied in Fortune's mood."—*All's Well*, V., 2.

"The malevolence of Fortune."—*Macbeth* III., 6.

"So weary with disasters tugged with Fortune."

*Macbeth* III., 1,

"A most poor man made tame to Fortune's blows."

*Lear* IV. 6.

"The fineness of which metal (constancy) is not found in Fortune's love."—*Troilus and Cressida* I., 3.

"Fortune that arrant whore."—*Lear* II., 4.

"False Fortune."—*Lear* V., 3.

"Giddy Fortune."—*Henry V.* III., 6.

"Harsh Fortune."—*Antony and Cleopatra* II., 6

"Crooked Fortune."—*Two Gentlemen*, IV. 1.

(In *Sonnet 121*, the dark mistress is called a "gentle cheater.")

The Sonnets inform us that Shakespeare sought, in his writings, no personal gain or glory. His mind was fixed upon posterity, and the immortality of the "heirs of his invention." Could there be a more splendid and lasting monument?

In the Proem to the "Great Instauration," Bacon writes :—

"For myself, my heart is not set upon any of those things which depend upon external accidents. I am not hunting for fame . . . and to look for any private gain from such an undertaking as this, I count both ridiculous and base. Enough for me, the consciousness of well deserving, and those real and effectual results with which Fortune herself cannot interfere."

R. L. EAGLE.

## THE RIVAL POET.

**B**ACONIANS are agreed, I think, that in the Sonnets, "Shakespeare" when not addressing his own Muse—the master-mistress, Apollo or the spirit of poesy—is soliloquizing, until, in Sonnet 127, we come to the famous "Dark Lady," whom I claim to have successfully shown, is the personification of Fortune. But there is still the difficulty of the "Rival Poet" (Sonnets 79-86) which, whether it has any bearing on the identity of "Shakespeare" or not, is an ever elusive and interesting subject. In Sonnet 78, Shakespeare tells us that whatever he writes he is indebted to the assistance or inspiration of his "love":—

Yet be most proud of that which I compile,  
Whose influence is thine, and born of thee.

In Sonnet 79, we learn that he has enjoyed the monopoly of this aid, but now his place is usurped by another:—

Whilst I *alone* did call upon thy aid,  
My verse alone had all thy gentle grace;  
But *now* my gracious numbers are decay'd,  
And my sick muse doth give *another* place.

This "better spirit" (Sonnet 80) has been generally supposed to mean Spenser, but it is clear that the Rival has only just appeared, whereas Spenser, at the time the Sonnets were written (1599-1603), was no more.

There can be no doubt about the "better spirit" being a poet, and a sonneteer praising the same Muse:

There lives more life in one of your fair eyes  
Than both your poets can in praise devise.

And does not Shakespeare refer to "the proud full sail of his great verse?" Who could this have been whose "spirit" was "by spirits taught to write above a mortal pitch,"—"compeers by night, giving him aid?"

There is a poet who answers this description, and whom I suggest is the Rival—Michael Drayton.

In his "IDEA" Sonnets he, like Shakespeare, addresses the poetic Muse in remarkably similar terms and with all the Shakespearean confidence in immortality. There were four distinct editions of Drayton's "IDEA" Sonnets—1594 (eighteen Sonnets), 1599 (twenty-one were added), in 1602 eight more appeared, and in 1605 seven more were added. In 1619 were printed, for the first time, the remaining ten.

In the 1599 and all later editions Drayton prefixed the following lines, "To the Reader of these Sonnets," which might have been applied equally well to the Shakespeare Sonnets. It is passing strange that the "men of letters" have not accepted the clue to the interpretation of the Shakespeare Sonnets supplied by these lines:—

Into these Loves, who but for Passion looks  
At this first sight, here let him lay them by!  
And seek elsewhere in turning other books,  
Which better may his labour satisfy.  
No far-fetched sigh shall ever wound my breast!  
Love from mine eye, a Tear shall never wring!  
No "Ah me!"s my whining sonnets drest!  
A Libertine! *fantastically I sing!*  
*My Verse is the true image of my Mind,*  
Ever in motion, still desiring change:  
And, as thus, to variety inclined;  
So in all humours sportively I range!  
My muse is rightly of the English strain,  
That cannot long one fashion entertain.

The main theme of the Shakespeare and the Drayton Sonnets is identical, and the terms employed by the respective authors, in working out this theme, are so similar that there would appear to have been some mysterious connection between the writings. In Sonnet 44 (1599) Drayton addresses his Muse:—



Whilst thus my pen strives to eternize thee,  
 Age rules my lines with wrinkles in my face,  
 Where, in the map of all my misery;  
 Is modelled out the world of my disgrace ;  
 Whilst in despite of tyrannizing times,  
 Medea-like, I make thee young again,  
 Proudly thou scorn'st my world-out-wearing rhymes,  
 And murderest virtue with thy coy disdain :  
 And though in youth my youth untimely perish,  
 To keep thee from oblivion and the grave  
 Ensuing ages yet my rhymes shall cherish,  
 Where I entombed my better part shall save ;  
 And though this earthly body fade and die,  
 My name shall mount upon eternity.

Compare the first line of this Sonnet with Shakespeare's Sonnet 81 :—

You still shall live (such virtue hath my pen).

Line 2 with Sonnet 63 :—

Against my love shall be as I am now,  
 With time's injurious hand crush'd and o'er-worn,  
 When hours have drain'd his blood and fill'd his brow  
 With lines and wrinkles.

The " tyrannizing times " are reflected in Shakespeare's Sonnet 66, and the last six lines again and again, notably in 18 :—

But thy eternal summer shall not fade,  
 Nor lose possession of that fair thow ow'st,  
 Nor shall death brag thou wandr'st in his shade,  
 When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st,  
 So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,  
 So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

Drayton's reference to his Muse as " my better part," reminds us of Shakespeare's Sonnet 39 :—

Oh, how thy worth with manners may I sing,  
 When thou art all the *better part* of me ?

Evidently our poets followed Horace :—

A monument I've reared more durable than brass, and loftier than the princely structure of the pyramids, which neither biting rain can overthrow, nor fierce north wind nor lapse of countless years and flight of time.

I shall not wholly die, and all my better part shall Libitina shun :

I shall increase in after-fame with glory ever fresh, etc.

Ode XXX., " The Poet's Immortal Love."

Shakespeare's Sonnet 55 is, of course, based directly upon Horace's ode. There is no need to dwell upon other instances of the curious harmony between these poets.

If, as I think can be shown, Shakespeare complimented Drayton on "the proud full sail of his great verse, bound for the prize of all too precious you," it is a happy allusion to this vigorous but graceful poet.

But how does Drayton qualify in respect to the aid of spirits by night? In "The Barons' Wars," Canto IV., Verse 39, Drayton, about to tell of "new sorts of plagues . . . strange apparitions and prodigious birth, unheard-of sickness and calamities," writes:—

Now lighter humour leave me and be gone,  
Your passion poor yields matter much too slight  
To write those plagues, that then were coming on,  
Doth ask a pen of ebon, and the night  
If there be ghosts their murder that bemoan,  
Let them approach me and in piteous plight  
Howl, and about me with black tapers stand  
To lend a sad light to my sadder hand.

In the First Canto, Verse 4, Drayton appeals for supernatural aid in his mighty attempt:—

O Thou, the wise director of my muse,  
Upon whose bounty all my powers depend,  
Into my breast thy sacredst fire infuse;  
Ravish my spirit this great work to attend  
Let the still *night* my laboured lines peruse  
That when my poems gain their wished end,  
Such whose sad eyes shall read this tragic story,  
In my weak hand may see thy might and glory.

Was this stanza in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote of "that affable familiar Ghost that nightly gulls him with intelligence"? Drayton seems the only likely candidate for the honours of the "Rival Poet."

R. EAGLE.

## JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

ON finding a mention by Fuller that a certain Dr. King had shown the bad taste and want of feeling, while attending the funeral obsequies of Sir Thomas Meautys, to "make sport" with the skull of the celebrated Lord Bacon, which in some way had become exposed, it became our duty to endeavour to trace who this personage was.

The authority quoted above tells us that in 1649 the vault of the Bacons, in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, was opened to receive the coffin of the man who had acted as Secretary so long to his kinsman, the author of *De Augmentis*. It was then seen that the skull of Lord Bacon lay separate from the body, and Dr. King picking it up, did make sport of it; "but," adds Fuller, "the man who made ridicule of it then, is since become the laughing stock of others."

In a former "Jottings" on this subject, we were inclined to speculate what speech Dr. King made on this occasion, and whether it was possible that he quoted the lines from *Hamlet*, where the Prince of Denmark says:—

*Why may not that be the scull of a lawyer. Where be his quiddets now, his quilletts, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel and will not tell him of his action of battery.*

And if Dr. King did so with the knowledge that the author's head was in his hands at the moment?

The Doctor King thus described, certainly called down ridicule and trouble upon himself in several ways, and he seems to have been a fussy, self-important man, who desired at all costs to be in the public eye.

His capabilities and intellect were of no mean order, and should have led him to great things, if an in-

ordinate vanity or self-esteem had not spoilt an otherwise strong intellect.

He was a Justice of the Peace in St. Albans, and in that remarkable old register, called "*Accounts of the St. Alban Grammar School between the years 1646 and 1659,*" we find he was one of its Governors, being described as "*John King, Doctor in Phisick.*"

He also undertook to be pay-master of the fees and tradesmen's bills in connection with this Free School, and his sons were educated there, the eldest entering as a scholar in 1644, and two more later on.

This eldest son, whose name also was "John," became more distinguished than his father ever was, for after receiving all the learning the St. Albans Free School could give him, he took a scholarship at Eton, and went on to Queen's College, Cambridge.

His taste led him to the Bar, and he eventually became King's Counsel and Attorney General to the Duke of York, and was knighted in 1674.

Referring back to Dr. John King, we find his name appears pretty often in the MS. Accounts of the Grammar School. This establishment was first started during Sir Nicholas Bacon's time, and he and his successors at Gorbambury helped to support it with donations of money, besides books, of which it received a considerable store.\* Several of its scholars afterwards occupied the position of Mayor to the town, and sat in Parliament. Some of the following items, culled from the accounts, may prove of interest to the readers of BACONIANA.

The stipend of the three Head Masters (in 1647), Mr. Greene, Mr. Steedham and Mr. Ditchfield, was respectively £24 13s. 4d. per annum, while the Usher received £6 10s.

\*Some of these books still exist there.

The scholars had to contribute £1 15s. for coals to keep themselves warm, and the school was furnished with an "hour glass," for which 8d. was paid. Candlesticks for the school cost £2 13s., and six extinguishers 9d.

The name of Gilbert Siliock, a vintner, occurs pretty often, as he occupied the important position of a Governor of the School, as well as being Landlord of the "Corner Tavern," and one item runs, "Item 1648, 1649. Recd. of Mr. Gilt. Selioke for one whole yeares rent for the Town wyne Lycence £11 00s. 00d.

"Item: Pd. by me John King, Doctor in Phissick, the 10th June, 1647, to Edward Clark, by vertue of an order from the Maior and Burgesses, dated 7th June, 1647, being the Lady Day rent of Mr. Gilbert Silliock, the sum of £5.

"Item: At the Maior's Court ye 20th Dec., 1647. It is ordered by the Maior and Burgesses of this Burrough that Doctor John King, is desired to pay William Hickman of the said Burrough the sum of £5, out of the monies in his hands that he hath received of Mr. Gilt. Silcock for his wyne licence as he was one of the Governors of the Free School, for the satisfyinge of the remainder of the 15 lb. which he payed for the use of the sd. Burrough according to our desire £5."

"Item: Pd. Doctor King's man ffor a warrant ffor ffechinge the Seasors before him for Seassinge the Schooleland £00 00s. 06d."

"Item: The 18th of Janry, 1647. Rec.: the day and year abovsaid by me William Hickman, of Doctor John King, ye sum of £5 according to the order of the Maior and Burgesses, being a full discharge of the fiftene pounds, which I have payd by their appointment for the use of the Burrough.

I say rec.

(Signed). WILL HICKMAN."

We are glad to see that the labours of the school were lightened by play-acting at their "breaking up."

"Item: Pd. the Musicke for playeing the sevrall scenes, when the boyes acted the two Commodies of "*Lingua*" and "*The Jealous Lovers*," at two of their breaking up. £00 10s. ood.

"Item: Given to the boyes that acted, £00 05s. ood., 15th of Decr., 1662."

On looking up references we find "*Lingua*" was written before 1602, by Thos. Tomkin, of Trinity Coll., Cambridge, and that it was acted before Queen Elizabeth, and first printed in 1607.

"*The Jealous Lovers*" is one of Thos. Randolp's best comedies. It was printed in quarto, 1632.

Some boyish pranks result in 2d. having to be spent in the following way:

Item: Payd to Mathias Clament for taking a stone out of the locke of the School doore, £00 00s. 02d."

Besides Dr. John King's labours in helping the workings and management of the Free School in St. Albans, he must have occupied the position of chief physician in the town, and no doubt had attended Sir Thomas Meautys, of Gorhambury, in his last illness, which ended in death, 1649. In the capacity of family doctor, he attended the funeral, and thought himself intimate enough with the family to handle the skull of Viscount St. Alban, and to make a ridiculous speech over it.

Unfortunately, there is no means of knowing what he said on the occasion.

During this year of 1649, Dr. King had found himself in trouble and opposition to his neighbours in the town, and he invoked Parliament to his aid. He, as Justice of the Peace, had evidently given an adverse decision, which caused the mob to handle the lordly person of the physician with violence, after which they proceeded to wreck his dwelling. Whereupon the

doctor asserted his authority, and vowed vengeance against his enemies. But he got little satisfaction, as the town continued in opposition to him in every way possible.

The ringleader in this riot was a Ralphe Pollard, who had been a scholar in the Free School, and in the State Papers at the Record Office of London the following is to be found :

“ June 15, 1649.

“ Council of State to the Mayor and Justices of the Peace of St. Albans.

“ There was lately a riot in your town upon the house and person of Dr. King, Justice of the Peace, and while he was in execution of that office, which, if it should pass without due prosecution, would be a great scandal to the Government and an encouragement to disaffected persons to stir up distempers among the people.

“ Let the parties offending be had in examination and information taken against them on oath, and that they may be proceeded against next Quarter Session.”

This “ distemper ” among the townspeople was not easily quelled by either Dr. King or the Government.

“ Aug. 11, 1649. Whitehall Council of State to the Attorney General. Not long since a riot was committed by certain inhabitants of St. Albans at the home and against the person of Dr. King. Complaint being made to the Council, we wrote to the Sessions and an indictment was preferred against them, but the Jury would not find a bill, notwithstanding the full and express evidence for it.

“ An information is therefore to be put into the Upper Bench, and you are to receive instructions from Dr. King, and take care the business be proceeded in effectually.”

The result of this appeal to the “ Upper Bench,” resulted in a warrant.

“ Warrant. To go to St. Albans and apprehend T. Dalton, W. Hensman, Ralpe Pollard, J. Cooper, Ed. Thomas, Thos. Reddey and A. Whelpley, for miscarriage against Dr. King.” (Whatever punishment was meted out to the offenders had little effect on their future—Ralpe Pollard for one, living to be Mayor of his native city from 1637 to 1647.)

These proceedings did not tend to add to Dr. King's popularity, and it is said that he threw up his public appointments in disgust in that year, and retired to London, where we find him described as of Aldersgate Street.

It was probably his failure in this law case that caused Fuller to say that “ now he is the laughed at by others.”

A. C. BUNTEN.



CHIEF EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF SIR THOMAS  
MEAUTYS, KNT., BROTHER OF LADY JANE  
CORNWALLIS, AND 2ND COUSIN TO SIR THOS.  
MEAUTYS, SECRETARY TO LORD BACON.

Thomas Meautys, the elder, must have been born about 1580 or a little later, at West Ham, Essex.

His father was Hercules Meautys, who married Phillippe, daughter of Richard Cooke, of Gidea Hall, Essex. This Miss Cooke was a granddaughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, Preceptor to King Edward VI.

Thomas Meautys entered the army as a young man, and was sent to his uncle, Thos. Wilson, in Ireland. He rose in rank, and obtained a Captaincy.

On August 18th, 1604, we find a letter from Captain Meautys to the Earl of Salisbury, whom he begs him not to credit the scandal laid on him by a shameless woman, who sues him for debt.

A little later, he must have quarrelled with Sir Francis (or Sir Horace Vere), August 16th, 1608. Sir Francis Vere to Lord Salisbury, from Tilbury begs him to nominate another person rather than Capt. Meautys for a certain post. The Captain having slandered him.

Before 1611, Captain Meautys lost a limb in fighting, and for his services he was knighted, *Knight Bachelor*; by the King at Whitehall, February 8th, 1611.

In February, 1611, Sir Thos. Meautys writes to the Lord Secretary Salisbury, and says his estate is brought low by expenses of his lost limb, and he begs the King's aid to buy an Exchequer pension of 1,000 marks per an., which is to be sold for £2,500, to support the rank lately conferred on him.

Later on he was engaged in the wars of the Palatinate with a company of English Volunteers in the pay of the Prince of Orange.

On October 17th, 1614, he writes to his sister, Lady Cornwallis, at Broome, in Suffolk, saying he has been at Tulyers for 16 weeks, and that he wishes news of her by the messenger he is sending with letters for the Court.

Again on December 7th, 1614, he writes to his sister to wish her "content" in her second marriage to Sir Nathaniel Bacon, and says he is still at Tulyers, which is 250 miles from the seaside. He is still at Tulyers in October, 1615, and also in 1616.

He writes again to her from Arnheim, November 7th, 1622. He writes from London to his sister, December, 1624, saying he had not heard from his mother (Phillipa Cooke), but understand she has been very ill. An affectionate brotherly letter. His mother is at Coventry.

In January, 1625, he writes to tell his sister he is going down to Coventry to marry the eldest daughter of Sir Richard Burneley, and that her portion is £1,500. He praises her very much and adds that his sister, Lady Sussex, has promised them £200 a year, and he asks a helping hand from Lady Jane also. He writes again, March, 1625, and April, saying he is now returning to the *Low Countries*.

In September, 1625, he writes an important letter to his sister from Colchester, saying he is employed at these "Marrytanyan" ports, for to raise sutch workes as I shall thinke fytttest for the preservation of of the Haven of Colchester. I have with me 500 foote, and a troope of horse, besides 200 foote which I founde in the towne before my aryvall.

"But I am to hasten my retourne to the Army for that the enymye is drawne down with more forses to Donkerick, and that all their fleet is drawne out of their harbour. I do want the assistance of servants exceedingly, and my Lord Warrick was fayne to lend me his page to attend me this jorny.

“ My poor wyfe hath not heard from me never since my coming from her, neither do I know how to send her.”

In July 1627, he is in London and writes to console his sister on the death of her second husband, Sir Nathaniel Bacon; a beautiful religious letter. He begs her to help him with some money, as he must leave some with his wife when he goes back to the Low Countries with Lord Vere. Money is owing him there, about £400.

After arriving at the Hague he writes to his sister that he has presented the gift she entrusted him with, to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, who opened it before the Court and praised it.

In April, 1628, Sir Thomas and Lady Meautys invited their cousin, Thomas Meautys (who was Clerk of the Privy Council and had formerly been private Secretary to Lord Bacon) to come over to the Low Countries to be present at the christening of their child there, but the Clerk of the Privy Council fears he cannot give a direct answer to his cousins until he has settled some “ term ” business concerning “ My Lord St. Alban’s Creditors.” He mentions this in a letter to Sir Thomas Meautys’ sister, Lady Jane Cornwallis.

In November, 1629, Mr. Long wrote and told Lady Jane Cornwallis he had received both the sums of money she sent him for her brother, Sir Thos. Meautys, one of £20, and the other of £66.

The £66 was for the redeeming of silver plate, &c., which Lieutenant Smyth had pawned in Cheapside, and the £20 was to procure men for the furnishing of his Company.

The men, plate, etc., were all sent over by Smyth to him in the Low Countries.

We learn in the same letter that Lady Jane Corn-

wallis has taken the place of a mother to his eldest boy, Hercules, who is at present in Mr. and Mrs. Long's care, but who has been ill with "ague."

Mr. Long adds that he presented this child to his uncle, the late Earle of Sussex, before he died, and that the Earle put him down in his will for a legacy of £300.

The next letter mentions the death of the child's grandfather, Sir Richard Burnaby, and that Lady Burnaby would now take care of the child (but we see that Lady Jane continues to keep the child). In the next letter there is talk of the child being sent to his parents in the Low Countries, and Mrs. Long tells Lady Jane how she has spent the £5 Lady Jane sent her for the child's maintenance.

In a letter from Sir Thomas Meautys to his sister, Lady Jane Cornwallis, 2nd December, 1632, from Arnheim, he mentions the grief of the Queen of Bohemia for the death of the King who died at Mentz, in Germany. Sir Thomas has been "waiting on the Queen at her Court at Rene," and the Queen sends kind messages to Lady Jane, and praises her, especially when she heard that Lady Jane still had the son of Sir Thomas living with her,—Hercules. He seems very proud of his little daughter, Nan, and says: "*When I cannot see my children it does me good to talk of them.*"

Lady Meautys writes to Lady Jane Cornwallis at Broome, from London, April 16th, 1633, saying she is about to join her husband in the Low Countries, and can Lady Jane send her the money which is really not due till Midsummer, as Sir Alexander Radcliffe and his wife, who promised them a yearly income, cannot give them anything at present, though they hope to do so later on.

A second letter to the same saying that if the Radcliffes don't pay her the £200 a year promised, she and

her children would have no money if anything happened to Sir Thos. Meautys, and begs Lady Jane's assistance in this matter.

In the next letter we see Lady Jane sent Lady Meauty's some money. The latter is sailing to join her husband in the Low Countries.

In a letter to Lady Jane from *Delft*, June, 1635, Lady Meautys says she is in attendance on the Queen of Bohemia, "who uses her with a great deal of favour." and has given her some of her own linen to make clothes, which is a consolation to her husband and herself in their many troubles.

Their children are still in England.

Lady Jane sent them £100 to Hague, and she still had their son with her in 1641, and in 1642.

January 5th, 1644, from the Hague, in a letter from Lady Meautys to her sister-in-law, Lady Jane Cornwallis, she thanks her for some money, without which she and her children would have had nothing to subsist upon, as they were starving. That Sir Thos. is still at Arnheim, and is "so miserably treated there by injustice that he has no money and through his heavy troubles he is growne very sickelie that those near him was doubtful of his recoveries, and that she intends leaving her children at the Hague and going to see him."

This is the last letter, and it is supposed that he then died.

His widow was living in 1659, and is named as a Legatee under the will of Lady Jane Cornwallis (Lady Bacon).

A. C. BUNTEN.

## THE SPEAR AND ITS LORE.

THE Spear that carries death to the enemy, and victory to the Grasper and Brandisher, is the emblem of Odin, the strong exultant One, the Silent One of Northern Mythology.

"The Spear trembled and the battle began." [Saga.]

*Erik*, Commander of hosts, threw Odin's Spear, and said "Odin owns you all."

When the Jarl (the high-born chief and warrior) grew up, he *shook the Spear* and threw the Javelin. The Sons of Jarl shook ash-Spears, and at *the Thing* the great Council or Meeting, resolutions were made by weapons taken up and *shaken*.

To the North-Man the Spear, and the Sword, was each a Light-bearer. Odin had swords carried into the great Hall, because they shone like fire, no other light was used while he and his warriors sat drinking. Odin's Spear was called *Gun-gnir*, his sword *Maekir*.

From the Spears of the *Valkyrja*, the nine Goddesses of Victory, too, sprang rays of light.

Our eclectic Francis, the Light-bearer, drew water from the Wisdom Well of the Ancients of all nations. Was he indebted in part to Scandinavia for his pseudonym of Shake-Spear? Hitherto we have believed it was to Pallas he went for that particular inspiration.

Edwin Reed, in his Shake-Spear *Pseudonym* reminds us that Pallas Athenæ and her Spear stood for the strength that is always inherent in the cause of Truth, and that her name, Pallas, was derived from "to shake," adding the fact that she was armed with a Spear which rose 70 feet in length in her statue by Phidias on the Acropolis, and that in Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon her name is given etymologically as

"THE BRANDISHER OF THE SPEAR,"

He says Pallas Athenæ represents not only Art in

general, but precisely that branch of Art to which the Plays of Shake-Spear belong, seeing that Richard de Bury, High Chancellor of England in the fifteenth century, and one of the most learned men of that age, said: "The Wisdom of the Ancients devised a way of inducing men to study Truth by means of pious frauds, the delicate Minerva, secretly lurking beneath the Masque of Pleasure." This is pointed out as the reason of the hyphen between the two symbols Shake and Spear, as printed in many of the original quartos, and also in the folio of 1623.

With the Light-bearing symbolism of the Spear in our minds, it is interesting to find that Francis says, "I have held out a light to posterity by a *Torch* set up in the obscurity of philosophy," also "Matters should not hang upon any one man's *sparkling and shaking Torch*."

The Scandinavian Nornir, or Fates, were the embodiment and philosophy of Life, who watered with whey water the Ash Yggdrasil. They dwelt by Urd's Well whose roots they watered with their wisdom and experience of the past. The water which fell thence was called *Honey-Dew*, and the *bees fed* on it. Two swans lived in Urd's Well, from whom sprang the kin of birds.

"Three Destinies (or Fates) in long robes of white Taffeta, like aged women, with Garlands of Narcissus, and in their left hands distaffs, and in their right hands carrying altogether a Tree of Golde," were brought upon the stage in a Masque, presented in the Banqueting Room at Whitehall on St. Stephen's night at the marriage of the Earl of Somerset and the Lady Frances Howard. This Masque is supposed to have been written by Thomas Campion, the letters of whose surname make the sentence, "I am Pacon," "but these things are but toys to come amongst such serious

its pathetic accompaniments of "virgin Kranz, maiden strewments," the sudden shock sustained by the noble youth whose heart was still hers, were all priceless experiences for him who looked upon Nature as God's Art, and reflected, as I think, this scene in the pellucid mirror of his artist soul with the best results.

That I believe Francis Bacon visited Liège in 1577-81 I have already stated in "Bacon and Portugal," (BACONIANA, January, 1914). We find that Edward Burnham in that year was sent to the battle-field of civil and political liberty, Holland, by Elizabeth and Walsingham, also that he passed through *Luicke* or *Licques* on his way, and conferred with Monsieur de Licques, who was, in all probability, the Bishop just referred to.

I will not repeat my reasons for believing Edward Burnham to have been Elizabeth's young Lord Keeper of State-Secrets, Francis, but merely register again the fact that I *do* think so, and that I also like to think the yet unwritten play of *Hamlet* was the richer for his embassy to Liège.

Margaret de Valois relates the untimely death of Mlle. de Tournon, *a relation of her own*, in her *Memoires*. She gives full details, including the white pall, and the *chaplets of flowers* that strewed the body.

A. A. LEITH.



## FINDS IN THE FOLIO.

PRINTS of the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare Plays are rarely available.

But facsimile reproductions may be obtained and should be studied. It is probable that every one of the plays is there earmarked with either Bacon's signature or other subtle indication of his authorship.

Where the clowns come on the scene there is often something ready for interpretation. Students should look out for passages where the author leaves the play and talks right out to them.

"KING JOHN."

The instance in *King John*, p. 2, is well known :—

"My deare Sir. Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin."

"HAMLET."

There is another in *Hamlet*, p. 259.

"Your bait of falshood takes this cape of truth ;  
And thus doe we of wisdome and of reach  
With windlesses and with assayes of Bias,  
By indirections finde directions out.  
So by my former lecture and advice  
Shall you, my sonne."

"Cape" means "cover." "Sonne," the intelligent reader and not Reynaldo.

Investigators should look out for the carefully screened communication, the indirect direction, and will find that the author is giving them much help.

"MUCH ADO."

How in *Much Ado*, page 111 (the K cipher count of the word "Bacon") the process by which the name George Seacole is changed into the name of the play's author, Francis Bacon, has already been explained in BACONIANA.

## "TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA."

*Two Gentlemen of Verona* shows a similar communication. Launce (which is a clown part) is the servant of Sir Protheus—a conjunction of significant names. At page 27, Launce says:—"Why stand—under and understand is all one." Just a line or so above, the word "staffe" stands under the word "Launce." A lance with a staff under it is a "speare." In reply to a question whether something will "*be a match*," Launce refers to his dog. "If hee shake his taile and say nothing it will." The context implies shake his head. In this way we get as head "shake" which added to "speare" gives "Shakespeare." Speed then remarks, "The conclusion is then that it will." Match B A to C O N, which is the conclusion gives Bacon. Launce comments, "Thou shalt never get such a secret from me but by a parable."

## "RICHARD II."

At the bottom of page 33 (the ordinary figure equivalent of the name Bacon) in *Richard II.*, the commencing capitals (omitting those beginning with T) give Fras. The first lines of the scene are:—

"My Lord of Salisbury we have stay'd ten days  
And hardly kept our *countrymen* together."

This we interpret as a direction to *count* ten.

Count ten lines from the bottom of the page, and we come to:—

"The *bay-trees* in our *countrey* all are wither'd."

This gives Baycoun, Ergo Fras. Bacon, the true author's signature disclosed by the inductive method of reasoning.

## "LOVE'S LABOUR LOST."

On page 129 of *Love's Labour Lost*, there is a line given once more to a Clown.

"O marrie me to one Francis."

The seven letters in Francis carry us to page 136. On this page, counting from the bottom of the first column the 33rd line is:—"What is A B spelt backward with the horn on his head." This gives B A Cornu, Latin for horn. In this way the clown (Shakespeare) is associated with Francis Bacon.

"KING LEAR."

A strongly proved Bacon signature is upon page 287 of *King Lear*. At the foot of the second column, reading from the bottom upwards the following words and syllable occur at the terminals of lines:—

is  
bee  
Con  
France  
Sir.

From these can be obtained the signature Sir Francis Bacon.

There is proof of the intentional placing of these terminals.

1. In the Quarto of this play the above words and syllable occur, but not in the terminals of lines.

2. In the Folio they appear except the turnover word "Sir" in the only lines which both (1) commence with a word in italics, and (2) continue right out to the margin of the column.

3. Counting the letters of each line, including the italic word, there are 33 letters up to "is," 33 letters up to "bee," 33 letters up to "Con," and 33 letters up to "France." This indicates a careful setting of the type of the Folio page.

4. The word "Servant" in the quarto is changed to "Knight" in the Folio and in the folio line ending with "bee" the word Knight is shortened to "Knigh,"

or the count of 33 letters would not have been maintained.

5. The word "Sir" is the turnover word, but it also occurs just above in the line:—

"Knigh Sir, he answered me in the roundest manner he."

A count beginning after this word Sir gives 33 letters.

6. In the same column after the stage direction, "Enter Steward," the first five lines give a running signature of Shakespeare, taking the first "S," the next "h," the next "a," to the "h," and so on.

King Lear calls the Steward a Fellow, and also a Clotpole.

On the following page 288 the king calls the Steward "whorson dog," "slave," "curre," "rascall." Kent calls him a base football plaier. Eliminate "football," and the base plaier is the Steward of the king's daughters (the plays?)

Students of the Folio will find it a rich mine of interesting covered communications. As a practice they might well begin at page 41, *Merry Wives*, bottom of its second column, and see how the author tells us he has translated Homer's *Iliad*.

PARKER WOODWARD.

W. E. CLIFTON.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR EDITOR,—“How little information do we gather as to the personality of Breton, Lodge, or Barnfield from their snatches of song scattered through the miscellanies.”  
[P. 171, Robert Herrick, by Moorman.]

This pithy little paragraph gives food for thought, let us chew upon it, as Francis Bacon would say. Certainly a close study of these poets' works makes for Francis Bacon being their sole beggetter.

A STUDENT IN BACONISM.

London, 1914.

“Experiment Solitary Touching Flying in the Air.”

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

[*Nat. History*, 886, Vol. I., Bacon's Works].

“It is reported, that amongst the Leucadians, in ancient time, upon a superstition they did use to precipitate a man from a high cliff into the sea; tying him about with strings, at some distance, many great fowls; and fixing unto his body divers feathers, spread, to break the fall. Certainly many birds of good wing, as kites and the like, would bear up a good weight, as they fly; and spreading of feathers thin and close, and in great breadth, will likewise bear up a great weight, being even laid, without tilting upon the sides. The farther extension of this experiment for flying may be thought upon.”

[The above comes with particular force to our notice when our flyers in the air have so distinguished themselves.]

Yours truly,

A BACONIAN.

## Bacon's Death.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Mrs. Bunten has satisfied me that the Thomas Meautys, who wrote the undated letter (said to have been written about April, 1626), containing the postscript “My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried” was his lordship's former Secretary, but at that date Clerk to the Privy Council.

Further, that he was not knighted until some time afterwards and that he was the person who married Anne, surviving child of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, a grandson of Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon.

My surmise about the possibility that the other Sir Thomas Meautys accompanied his lordship of St. Albans in an escape abroad, must be abandoned.

But the above remarkably unemotional postscript rather emphasizes my belief that we cannot accept this statement by the former Secretary and always devoted friend, as final.

There are too many curious incidents to permit of this, and, about which, light may be forthcoming any day.

PARKER WOODWARD.

## In Regard to Bacon's Delicate Health.

### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

The writer of the letter on pages 122-3 of the April BACONIANA, who signs his missive "A Lover of Facts," was very far astray in one of his facts, when he got the two Thomas Meauty's so badly mixed as shown on pages 111 and 121. He states in this letter "but what we know of his (Bacon's) delicate health precludes that conclusion," that is the conclusion that he lived to 1668. His attention might be called to letter written in 1668 by Bacon's friend and secretary, Sir Thomas Bushell (16 -1672) who laments the death of his old friend and teacher, Viscount St. Alban. Bushell is careful not to indicate the precise time of his Patron's death, but judging from other data it is very easy to guess that it was of a recent date. It is a well-known fact, that frequently just the people of "delicate health" are those who live the longest. A great uncle of the writer lived to the age of 93 years; all his life he was a man of "delicate health," but he took good care of himself and lived to be many years older than his more vigorous brothers and sisters. An uncle of the writer is still living at the age of 98 and one-half years, the oldest living graduate of Yale University (of New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.), he has always been a man of "delicate health." It is a well-known fact that Viscount Saint Alban had a medical man, Peter Boenor, in his employ for many years to attend to his health, the result was that Bacon learned how to preserve his life beyond the lives of his contemporaries.

In the 17th century a Moses Wheeler, born in 1598, in Kent County, England, died January 15th, 1698, in Stratford, Connecticut Colony of New England, aged 100 years. A John Moss, born in 1603, in England, died in 1707, at New Haven, Connecticut Colony, aged 104 years. A Thomas Finch, baptized in 1612, at Bocking, England, died in 1704 at Norwalk, Connecticut Colony, aged 92. Undoubtedly similar cases of longevity can be recorded of people in England at that time, Therefore, judging from these well-authenticated cases, it is not at all improbable or impossible that Viscount Saint Alban lived to the age of 107 years. It might be noted here that the celebrated "Northumberland manuscripts" were brought to light in 1867, about 200 years after 1668.

ANOTHER "LOVER OF FACTS."

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—While noting down curious parallels between George Chapman in his "Iliads" and Bacon and Shake-speare, such as "dotard" used by Bacon, and "top-filled" as used in the present tense of the coined verb by Lady Macbeth, I found the following passage, a vastly pleasant one if read in the light of our splendid British soldiers of to-day and their fine morale:—

"Atrides yet coasts through the troops, confirming men so staid :

'O friends,' said he 'hold up your minds ; strength is but strength of will ;

Rev'rence each other's good in fight, and shame at things done ill.

Where soldiers show an honest shame, and love of honour lives,

That ranks men with the first in fight."

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

[Homer's "Iliads," Vth Book.]

FRANCIS BACON'S VIEW OF THE  
ANNIVERSARY OF TRAFALGAR,  
21ST OCTOBER, 1914.

"This Island is become the Lady of the Sea."—*Resuscitatio*.

"The seas are our walls and the ships our bulwarks."—*Letter to Buckingham*.

"Surely at this day the advantage of strength at sea which is one of the principal dowries of this Kingdom of Great Britain are great."—*Ess : of Kingdoms*.

"How great the honor is to keep and defend the approaches and avenues of this kingdom."—*Advice to Essex*.

"We have ships and boats for going under water and brooking of seas."—*New Atlantis*.

"Whoever is Master of the Sea is Master of the Empire."—*De Augustis*.

**ERRATA.**—In Miss Alicia Leith's article, "Something About Arundel House," which appeared in *BACONIANA*, April, 1914, p. 97, Canterbury Mansion should have been printed Canonbury Mansion. Also page 99, "Gilbert Sulbut's daughter" should be "Gilbert Talbot's." Both printer's errors occur in footnotes.





